This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

3 3433 06912469 5

Unitarian
ZXDA

THE

UNITARIAN MISCELLANY

AND

CHRISTIAN MONITOR.

Charity rejoiceth in the truth.—*Paul to the Corinthians.*

Those creeds are best, which keep the very words of Scripture; and that faith is best, which hath greatest simplicity.—*Jeremy Taylor.*

VOL. V.

Baltimore:

PUBLISHED, MONTHLY, BY THE PROPRIETORS.

Sold by

F. Lucas, Jr. and Etting Mickle, Market-st.

JOHN D. TOY, PRINTER.

1824.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
146944
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.
1900.

CONTENTS OF VOL. V.

No. XXXIII.

Authority of the Lord's Supper—Unreasonableness of excessive worldly Anxiety—Toleration and Liberty of Opinion—Sparks' Theological Collection—A Psalm, translated from Klopstock—Plainness of the Christian Doctrines—Unitarian Fund Society—Scripture Lessons—Installation at Medford. p. 1

No. XXXIV.

Christ in the Form of God—Creeds the Source of Intollerance—Christ the Master of his Disciples—Spirit of Orthodoxy—Early Unitarians in Poland—Obituary of the Hon. George Cabot—Influence of a Knowledge of God—Unitarian Society at Pittsburgh. p. 37

No. XXXV.

State of the Dutch Church—An Eastern Tale—Milton on Heresy—Queen Mary on Heresy—Objects of Prayer—The Treasures of the Deep—Colman's Dedication Sermon—Transylvania University—Theological Institution at Cambridge—Obituary Notice—Unitarian Church in Pittsburgh—Cold Preaching. p. 85

No. XXXVI.

Doctrine of two Natures in Christ—Attacks on the Characters of Unitarians—Nature and Design of the Lord's Supper—Obituary of the Rev. Mr. Christie—New Work proposed by Rammohun Roy—Installation at Brooklyn. p. 121

No. XXXVII.

Doctrine of two Natures in Christ—A New Year's Wish—A Story, from Sadi—Two went up into the Temple to Pray—Religion the Friend of Mental Improvement—Liberty of the Press—Dr. Murdock's Discourse on the Atonement—Third Annual Report of the Baltimore Unitarian Book Society—Ordination at New Bedford. p. 157

No. XXXVIII.

The Thirty-nine Articles of Unitarianism—Observance of the Lord's Day—To a friend on the Death of his Son, by Væsemsky—Church and State—Mediatorial Office of Christ—Spirit of Orthodoxy—More Spirit of Orthodoxy—Obituary of Judge Toulmin—The Christian—Ordination at Biddeford. p. 205

No. XXXIX.

Virtue the great End of Christianity—Liberality of the Quarterly Review--Incomprehensibility of God—Mortality and Immortality—Repentance and Conversion—Jeremy Taylor on Death-bed Repentance—Installation Exercises at Brooklyn. p. 241

No. XL.

Efficacy and obligation of the Lord's Supper—Sir Isaac Newton's Unitarianism—Sir Isaac Newton's History of the Text of the three Heavenly Witnesses—Spirit of Orthodoxy in the West---Geneva Catechism, Third Part. p. 277

THE

UNITARIAN MISCELLANY

AND

CHRISTIAN MONITOR.

No. XXXIII.] SEPTEMBER, 1823. [Vol. V.

Authority of the Lord's Supper.

In an essay on religious rites, in the last number of the Miscellany, it was proposed to consider in some future ones, the authority, nature, design, efficacy, and obligation of that rite of christianity, which we usually denominate the Lord's Supper.

First of all it is necessary to settle *the authority* of this rite. We must determine whether our Saviour did, or did not intend, that such a form should be observed by his followers, before we can, with any propriety, enter into an investigation of its influences and effects; for though it might be proved that many good results would arise from our calling to remembrance by some outward signs the death of our Saviour, there is no reason why the form of eating bread and drinking wine should be adopted in preference to several others. And even if it could be shown that such a form *was* the best possible manner of commemorating that great event, still would it be deficient in the dignity and high obligation, which must necessarily belong to a command of Jesus Christ. It

would be an observance of mere expediency—an expediency too, which we had discovered ourselves, and which we should consider ourselves at liberty to supersede, from convenience, and at will. Nay, more; it would be divested of that sacredness, and solemnity, and deep and affecting interest, which are naturally associated with a dying injunction of our Master and Saviour; and of the power, likewise, which it would assume from being acknowledged an instituted part of his divine religion. It appears, therefore, that the nature, design, efficacy, and obligation, of the rite of the Communion, are founded on its authority.

What then are the grounds of our belief that the Lord's Supper is an established ordinance of our religion? What is there in the accounts which are given of it in the Scriptures, which would lead us to view it in any other light, than in that of a particular occurrence, which took place on the mournful night in which Jesus was betrayed, and which, from that impressive circumstance, was thought fit to be recorded? Did he, in the first place, intend that they who were then present should ever repeat it? And if so, did he, in the second place, intend that its observance should be confined to them, and expire with them, or, on the contrary, that it should be obligatory on all his disciples, and be transmitted to the latest ages?

In order to obtain the most satisfactory solution of these inquiries, we must recur to the accounts of the transaction, which are handed down to us by the sacred writers. In matters of subsidiary importance, and in the investigation of the history, fluctuations, and changes of opinions, we do well in referring to *custom, tradition*, and the documents of the church,

but when we are to decide what is, and what is not, a precept, doctrine, or ordinance of our religion, we are without excuse if we resort to any authorities but the sacred books of that religion, or are satisfied with any decisions but such as those books contain. Whatever the streams may be, we shall be sure to quench our thirst purely at the fountain head.

The history of the institution of the Lord's Supper is given by four of the sacred writers, and may be found in the twenty-sixth chapter of Matthew, from the twenty-sixth to the twenty-ninth verse; in the fourteenth chapter of Mark, from the twenty-second to the twenty-fifth verse; in the twenty-second chapter of Luke, from the nineteenth to the twenty-first verse; and in the first epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, the eleventh chapter, from the twenty-third to the twenty-seventh verse. These are the accounts, and the only accounts of this transaction, which are given in the Scriptures; they will therefore be my only authorities in attempting to ascertain its true nature and design; and as I shall have frequent occasion to refer to them, I shall quote them at length, in the order in which they stand.

The account of Matthew is as follows;

"And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

The words of Mark bear a close resemblance to those of Matthew.

"And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them; and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many."

The next account is that of Luke.

"And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body, which is given for you; this do, in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you."

The remaining account is the one given by Paul, in the following words;

"For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you; this do, in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament* in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come."

* Instead of *testament*, it would be better, in these passages, to translate the Greek διαθηκη by the word *covenant*. It will be remarked, that the phraseology of Matthew and Mark, in this place, differs a little from that of Luke and Paul; the two former having, "This is my blood of the new testament," and the two latter, "This cup is the new testament in my blood." Both phrases, however, intend the same sentiment, which may be thus expressed; This cup of wine represents my blood, which is to seal the new covenant between God and man.

These are the histories which we have of the Last Supper; and from these it may be clearly proved, that Jesus laid an injunction on the twelve disciples to repeat the ceremony of eating bread and drinking wine in remembrance of him; and also, that the same injunction was designed to be obligatory on all his disciples, in every succeeding age; in short, that the Lord's Supper is an established rite of the Christian religion.

In the first place, it may be clearly proved from these accounts, that our Saviour intended that the disciples who were then with him, should repeat the ceremony of eating bread, and drinking wine, for the express purpose of recalling him vividly to their memories, when he should be no more among them. What other construction, indeed, can the words be made to bear? "And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body, which is given for you." Thus far, a present action only is described; Jesus broke the bread, and gave it to his disciples, that they might eat it at that time. But he immediately adds, "This do, in remembrance of me." These words, surely, can have no relation to their eating the bread at that time; for how could they eat it *in remembrance* of him, before he was taken away from them? We cannot be said to do any thing *in remembrance* of our friends, while they are with us, and in our sight. It is not till they have gone to distant regions, or to the unseen world, that their memory begins to live and be cherished in our hearts. It was not, therefore, till after Jesus had surrendered his life on the cross, had ascended to the bosom of his Father, and had left his disciples without their master and guide, that they could perform any action in remem-

brance of him, and still less, in remembrance of that sad event, which removed him from their eyes. The words are necessarily prospective, they have nothing to do with the present, and regard the future alone; and if they do not mean, that the twelve were to repeat the form prescribed, I am wholly unable to discover any design or meaning in them. It is not even going too far to say, that if the disciples did not eat bread, and drink wine, in remembrance of their Lord, after his death and ascension, they never could have obeyed the command, "This do in remembrance of me," because they could not have obeyed it at the time when it was given, when he was alive, and in their company. The conclusion is inevitable, that a form was then instituted by our Saviour, which his disciples were afterward to repeat.

That the repetition of this form was not to be confined to one observance, or to any particular period, is manifest from a clause in Paul's account, by which we are informed that when Jesus gave the cup, he said, "This do ye, *as oft as ye drink it*, in remembrance of me." The phrase "as oft as ye drink it," implies that the disciples were to continue the rite indefinitely, and perform it frequently; while at the same time it leaves them at liberty to determine how frequently the performance should take place.

I shall now proceed to consider the question, in which we of the present day are more especially concerned. Was it the design of our Saviour, that the observance of this rite should be extended beyond his immediate disciples, and regard all who should ever be, or become his followers? Are we, are all Christians, required, or are we not required, to eat bread, and drink

wine, at successive and discretionary periods, in remembrance of our Lord? In determining this, as well as the former question, we must refer to the Scripture histories.

In the accounts of Matthew and Mark we are informed, that the reason which Jesus gave for commanding his disciples to drink wine in remembrance of him was, that his blood, of which it was the representative and symbol, was to be "*shed for many;*"—not for them alone, but for many, that is, for all who would make use of the inestimable advantages, which the death of Christ places within our power of application. This reason addresses itself to us, with as much force as to the apostles. The blood of Christ was shed for us, as well as for them. The just one expired on the cross, and descended into the tomb, that he might secure, by his resurrection, for us, as well as for them, the hope, and the pledge, of immortality. Now, if we will reflect, that the above mentioned reason applies equally to all Christians, and that the celebration of the Supper is not, by the least word or intimation, limited to the apostles, the result of our reflections must be, that all of us, who call ourselves Christians, are required, as positively as they were who sat at the table with their master, to eat bread and drink wine, as symbols of the body which was broken, and the blood which was shed, for all.

This result will receive confirmation, when we consider, that our Saviour blessed and distributed the bread and wine, while he was keeping the Jewish Passover with his disciples. This festival commemorated the deliverance of the Israelites out of Egypt; and as that event was an occasion of lively gratitude to the

whole Jewish nation, every individual was required to celebrate it, and one generation handed it down to another. There is every reason to suppose, from the coincidence of circumstances, that Christ in like manner intended, that every Christian should commemorate the event, which to every Christian was of infinite concern; and that no age should cease to commemorate it, since to all ages it was to extend its influence and blessing.

I regard the foregoing considerations as sufficient proof that the Lord's Supper is an instituted rite of our religion. But if any doubt on the subject should remain, it ought to be dispelled by two indisputable facts. The first is, that the Christians of the primitive age, the cotemporaries, companions, and converts, of the apostles, did actually put the same meaning on our Saviour's words, which I have supported as the only true one; and that they frequently met together to eat bread and drink wine in remembrance of him, and in obedience to his command. The second is, that the apostle Paul unequivocally asserts, that he was instructed by Jesus himself in the origin and design of this ceremony.

Ample evidence of these facts may be found in the tenth and eleventh chapters of Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians. They plainly show, in the first place, that the primitive Christians did really consider the form of eating bread, and drinking wine, in remembrance of Christ, an established rite of the religion which they professed, and that they were, accordingly, in the constant habit of performing it. What inference can be drawn more plainly from the following

words;* "The cup of blessing, which *we* bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread, which *we* break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we, *being many*, are one bread and one body, for we are *all* partakers of that one blood." Here we have an unquestionable allusion to the sacrament of the Supper, as an acknowledged, undoubted, and universally celebrated, ordinance of Christianity. And all the instructions and rebukes of the apostle, in the succeeding chapter, go upon the constant supposition, that they to whom he was writing had been long accustomed to the performance of the rite, and that they considered it as much a command of the Saviour, as they did the injunction to love one another. If it was a command to them, it is a command to us; for it has been abrogated by no subsequent command, or circumstance.

In the second place, we have, in the eleventh chapter, the assertion of an apostle, that Jesus himself taught him the manner and the object of this institution. "I have received of the Lord," says he, "that which also I delivered unto you." This assertion ought to be completely satisfactory and conclusive. If the primitive Christians had been mistaken in the meaning which they attributed to the words of Jesus, those words would never have been repeated by Jesus himself, without an explanation of them, and a correction of the error. If Jesus had intended that the twelve disciples alone should remember him in the rite of his Supper, he would not have enjoined its performance on St. Paul, as that apostle was not one of the original disciples. If St. Paul had "received of the Lord" the ordi-

* Chap. x. verses 16, 17.

nance of the Supper, as one which was to be limited to any particular number of communicants whatever, he would not have delivered it again to the whole body of his converts.

Let me now bring together into one view the conclusions which I have attempted to establish. First, it is apparent from the words of our Saviour, which have been quoted, that he expected his twelve disciples to eat bread and drink wine, at stated periods, purposely in remembrance of him, when he should be no longer with them. Secondly, there are expressions used by our Lord, which obviously intimate his design, that this observance should become an established rite of his religion, and be celebrated by all his future disciples. Thirdly, the coincidence of the transaction in season and circumstances with a Jewish festival warrants a similar inference. Fourthly, the fact that the early Christians did really perform such a rite is full confirmation of its universal authority. Fifthly, if further confirmation were wanted, it would be furnished by the declaration of the apostle Paul, that he received the institution from the Master himself, who confirmed from Heaven what he had pronounced while on earth.

Before dismissing this division of our subject, however, it will be proper to notice, and to answer, *the objections*, which have been made to the authority of the Lord's Supper.

It has been asserted by those who deny that Jesus had any intention of instituting such a rite, that the first Christians were mistaken in their interpretation of his words. This assertion, as it stands by itself, unconnected with any arguments, has been already sufficiently answered by the fact, that our Saviour, in his

communication to the apostle of the Gentiles, took no notice of any such misapprehension; which he certainly would have done, had it existed.

But, in support of the assumption, it has been said, that no command is implied in the phrase, *as oft as ye drink it*, and therefore no obedience could be expected. There seems to me to be no force in this argument, whatever. If the observance of the rite was meant to be entirely optional, the phrase would have been, "This do ye, *if ever ye should drink it*," or something to the same effect. But the other mode of expression, "as oft as ye drink it," plainly implies a confident expectation that they *would* perform the rite, and that frequently.

Another objection which has been advanced is, that as much reason exists for observing *the washing of one another's feet*, as an instituted rite of our religion, as for partaking of bread and wine. It is urged that the action of Jesus, in washing his disciples' feet, as recorded in the thirteenth chapter of John, was accompanied with as remarkable circumstances, and as strong injunctions, as those which attended his celebration of the Paschal Supper; that each step of the transaction is as carefully particularized, such as his laying by his garments, girding himself with a towel, pouring out the water, washing their feet, and wiping them; and that the injunction, "If I, your lord and master, have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another's feet," is as forcible as that conveyed in the words, "Do this in remembrance of me."*

* These objections are chiefly made by the Quakers. See the thirteenth Proposition of Barclay's Apology.

Now, if this were all true, what would the objection, in its utmost force and extent, prove? That we were wrong in repeating *one* of the ceremonies? Not so; but that we came short of our duty in not repeating *the other*. It would not prove that we observed a form, which was not a commanded rite of our religion, but that we omitted the observance of one, which was so.

An examination of this argument, however, with the circumstances on which it is founded, will show it to be destitute of importance. There is nothing in the course of the transaction in question, which would lead the reader to suppose, that our Saviour expected his disciples to wash one another's feet, as a stated and ritual practice. Neither is there any positive command connected with the action. "After he had washed their feet, and had taken his garments, and was set down again, he said unto them, Know ye what I have done unto you? Ye call me Master and Lord, and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also *ought* to wash one another's feet. For I have given you *an example*, that ye should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, the servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him." The meaning of this is obvious enough. The whole occurrence, especially when it is taken in connexion with the words of Jesus, has the air of a symbolical action, performed to inculcate and impress an important practical duty. It was the intention of our Saviour to recommend to his disciples the virtues of mutual kindness, respect, forbearance, and humility. He did this most effectually, by performing for them an *office*, which was usually the task of a menial; and by

enforcing on their minds the striking consideration, that if he, their lord and master, exhibited such a proof of condescension, they ought surely to follow his example toward their equals, and exercise the same gentle and lowly temper in their intercourse with each other. His example, in this respect, was no authority for a religious ceremony, simply because he did not teach his disciples so to regard it. He performed the action, not for the purpose of commanding its repetition, but of taking occasion to explain its moral design; not to institute a rite, but to inculcate a Christian temper and duty. "Do this in remembrance of me," is a positive command to perform an action, which, in itself, would indicate no particular moral disposition. "Ye also ought to wash one another's feet," is the recommendation of an action, which, like many others of a similar nature, would be a proof of an amiable temper, and a good heart.

There remains a consideration, which will easily decide the question, if there should still any question exist on the subject. We have not the least [illegible] that the primitive Christians ever observed such a rite as that of washing one another's feet. If they had failed in their duty in this respect, it is most reasonable to suppose, that in the instructions given by our Saviour to St. Paul, he would, while sanctioning the observance of one rite, have explained his intentions with regard to the other.

As the objections which have been stated, therefore, appear to have no force, the arguments for the authority of the Lord's Supper remain unaffected.

Unreasonableness of excessive worldly Anxiety.

There is hardly any practical error to which we are more exposed from the circumstances of our present condition, than a spirit of undue solicitude in regard to future trials. We know that we live in a world, which is often darkened by clouds, and agitated by tempests of affliction; and our past experience has told us that we, as well as others, must look for a share in human calamity. Hence it is, that we too naturally yield to a distrustful and anxious concern for the future; and to the trials which we actually receive from the hand of Providence, we add innumerable others of our own creation. We are not indeed required to shut our eyes on the calamities which threaten us, or to suppose that any confidence which we can repose in the care and goodness of our heavenly Father, can for a moment, supersede the necessity of our own exertions; on the contrary, it is our duty to exercise a prudent foresight, and to endeavour by all proper means to avert the evils which we apprehend. But after all, our duty, our happiness require, that we should not be unduly solicitous about the result. After using all the means which Providence has put within our power, we are submissively to leave the event with God.

One consideration which shows the folly of excessive anxiety concerning the future is, that every day has trials enough of its own. Whatever may be our condition in life, it is perfectly vain to think of avoiding trials; and it is not improbable that they are distributed among mankind with much more equality than is often imagined. You are a poor man, and look perhaps

with an envious eye on the condition of your rich neighbour, who, you are ready to imagine, moves in a circle so much above you, that he breathes only the atmosphere of peace and joy. But it is not improbable, if you could know the whole of the case, that you might think it a hard bargain, on your part, to exchange your situation, with all its inconveniences, for his, with all its splendour. Perhaps the world may see the *worst* of *your* case; but in *his*, amidst all the pomp and show of wealth, there may be concealed a worm, a canker corroding at the heart, which makes even his riches a burden to him. But however this may be, it is certain that no situation in life can exempt us from trials; and not only so, but these trials recur frequently, and are interwoven with the experience of every day. Perhaps there is not a day of your life in which every thing moves onward exactly as you could wish; some disappointment, or cross, or change of circumstances occurs, so trifling, or so common, it may be, that you do not remember it, which is calculated to wound, or irritate, or disturb your feelings. Now then, as each day brings with it its own peculiar trials, it is unwise to increase them by anticipating others which are future. Every day has enough of its own, as many as we shall be like to bear, either with patience or profit.

Another reason why this excessive anxiety should not be indulged is, that it prevents us from profiting, either by the afflictions which we suffer, or those which we anticipate. The design of every afflictive dispensation is to do us good, to impress us more deeply with a sense of our dependence, and to advance our preparation for heaven. But in order to the accomplishment of this benevolent purpose, it is necessary that

we should co-operate with the providence of God, in the use of those means, which he has prescribed. We are to examine our own hearts, and endeavour to ascertain what errors we indulge, which need to be corrected; we are to feel and acknowledge that our afflictions are most richly deserved, and endeavour to reverence and adore the hand, by which they are laid upon us. Above all, we are to pray fervently that they may be accompanied by a divine influence, and may produce in our hearts and lives the peaceable fruits of righteousness. But who does not see that all this is totally inconsistent with that excessively anxious state of mind which we are contemplating? The person who indulges it cannot possibly be in a situation to profit by present trials; for his mind, when it *should* be employed in learning the lessons which God is teaching him by passing dispensations, is engrossed by gloomy forebodings, either of real or imaginary future afflictions.

Nor does this state of undue solicitude prepare him who is the subject of it for the trials which he anticipates, even admitting them to be real. On the contrary, it is fitted to destroy his fortitude, to weaken his resolution, and to relax all the energies of his mind to such a degree, as almost of course to defeat the gracious designs of Providence in his affliction.

A third reason why the extreme anxiety of which we have spoken should not be indulged is, that it implies a distrust of the providence of God. What if we *are* to be the subjects of severe and overwhelming affliction? Do we not believe that every circumstance of our condition is shaped and ordered by an infinitely wise and righteous Providence; and that the designs of that Providence towards us are only merciful? What if the

companion of your bosom, or the staff of your declining years seems likely to be taken from you? Is it not your duty to recognize the providence of God in this dispensation, and to improve it as a chastisement from *his* hand? Why then allow yourself to be unduly anxious in regard to an event which you cannot control, and which you may be certain will be directed by infinite wisdom for some benevolent purpose? The language of this spirit is, that we have not sufficient confidence in our heavenly Father to commit the ordering of our lot to him; it implies a distrust either of his power, or his wisdom, or his faithfulness. I need not say how entirely inconsistent such a spirit is with that humble and submissive temper, which always ought, and always does, in a greater or less degree, characterize the child of God.

Again, an unduly anxious spirit in regard to the future is not to be justified, because it not only renders ourselves unhappy, but poisons the enjoyment of those around us; and moreover, it imposes a check upon our usefulness in society. We are all bound to do what we can for the promotion of each other's happiness; but the person who is forever indulging gloomy forebodings with respect to the future, and anticipating every evil which is within the range of possibility, is sure to diffuse something of the coldness and melancholy of his own feelings through the whole circle in which he moves. It is hardly possible to be continually in the company of a man of this character, and maintain that serenity of mind, which is so important to the faithful discharge of our duty. Moreover, the person in question imposes an effectual bar to his own usefulness. Not only does this complaining temper render him un-

fit for many of the duties of life, but it is so manifestly contrary to the spirit of the gospel, that it must detract greatly from the influence even of his good example. If we may suppose the case that he is in other respects an exemplary Christian, still this will be a blot upon his character which the world will not overlook, and which will cast into the shade many bright and excellent qualities. Whether therefore, we consider its influence upon himself, or the world around him, we see that it is in both respects equally to be deprecated.

We are also forbidden to be unduly anxious concerning the future by the consideration that such a temper is fatal to the spirit of devotion. In order that we may be in a proper frame for communion with God, it is necessary that our minds should be calm and peaceful; that we should be able to exclude the cares of the world which more immediately press upon us; and much more, that we should restrain our thoughts from an impatient and anxious anticipation of future evils. Moreover, one of the very first impressions to which the soul should surrender itself in a season of devotion, is that of entire submission to the divine will; in prostrating ourselves before the Majesty of heaven we do virtually commit all our concerns to the disposal of God, and profess our confidence in his righteous government. But how can a person, whose mind is perpetually harassed by gloomy anticipations, approach acceptably the presence of Jehovah? If he attempts to collect his thoughts, and fix them on the great object of worship, he will find the effort almost as vain as if he were to try to confine the wind. If he ventures with his lips to profess his confidence in the Divine government, he is admonished of a most melancholy discord-

ance between his language and his feelings, which he knows cannot escape the observation of the heart-searching God. In short, it is in vain for a person, who is under the influence of this spirit, to think of bringing an acceptable offering to the throne of mercy. At best, it will be a partial, a divided sacrifice. There will be wanting that composure and solemnity of mind, that deep impression of divine things, and above all, that submissive and childlike temper which is absolutely essential to a gracious acceptance.

Let it be remembered too, as another reason why we should guard against an undue solicitude concerning the trials of life, that these trials will soon be over. "For what is your life? It is even a vapour, that appeareth for a little while, and then vanisheth away." Even if your life is filled up with afflictions, yet, after all, it is so short that it seems unworthy of an immortal mind to be greatly troubled in regard to it. It may be that a few years, or even a few days, will bring it to its close; but if it should be protracted to the remotest period, the moment of its termination will soon be here. Suppose then, what is the most unfavourable that can be supposed in regard to it, that your future days are to be one continued scene of trouble; that the grave is at short intervals to open and receive the friends who are nearest to your heart; that you are to be afflicted with a most grievous malady, and never again to enjoy the blessing of health; that you are to be deserted by your friends, and left alone to contend with the caprice, and ingratitude, and cruelty, of the world. Suppose all this, I say, and what is the amount of it? Why simply, that this momentary period of your existence is

to be filled up with trouble, and then, if it be not your own fault, you are to enter an eternity of boundless joy. Yes, Christians, this life is too transitory, too much like a dream of the night, to warrant much anxiety in regard to our lot, while we continue in it. If God is pleased to grant us a comparatively happy lot, it becomes us to rejoice with gratitude in the blessings of his providence; and if he is pleased to plant thorns in every step of our path, it will be but a little while before we shall have reached its utmost limit.

And finally, why should we be anxious for the trials of life, when we know that they are designed to prepare us for heaven? All the discipline of God towards his children is intended to make them better, to refine and exalt their graces, and to prepare them for a higher seat in glory. How unbecoming then is it to repine against the dispensations of heaven, when those dispensations are intended for our benefit? They may be, indeed they often are, mysterious, but can we not confide in the promise of God, that whatever of darkness may rest over them at present, we shall finally be satisfied that they were working for us an exceeding and eternal weight of glory? There are not improbably thousands of redeemed saints on Mount Zion above, who look back with unutterable joy to scenes of affliction, which once broke their hearts; and connect with those scenes some of the purest and holiest notes of praise, which now flow from their golden harps. Let us, therefore, while we sojourn in this world of comparative darkness, be contented to bear the trials of life with patience, resting in the promise of God, that all things shall work together for good, and looking for-

ward to that world, where we shall see as we are seen, and where the plan of Providence will unfold to our enraptured view, in all its perfection and glory forever.

B.

Toleration and Liberty of Opinion.

From the Preface to Bishop Watson's Theological Tracts.

We live in a dissolute but enlightened age; the restraints of our religion are ill suited to the profligacy of our manners; and men are soon induced to believe that system to be false, which we wish to find so; that knowledge, moreover, which spurns with contempt the illusions of fanaticism and the tyranny of superstition, is often unhappily misemployed, in magnifying every little difficulty attending the proof of the truth of Christianity, into an irrefragable argument of its falsehood. The Christian religion has nothing to apprehend from the strictest investigation of the most learned of its adversaries; it suffers only from the misconceptions of sciolists, and silly pretenders to superior wisdom; a little learning is far more dangerous to the faith of those who possess it, than ignorance itself. Some, I know, affect to believe, that as the restoration of letters was ruinous to the Romish religion, so the further cultivation of them will be subversive of Christianity itself; of this there is no danger. It may be subversive of persecutions, of anathemas, of ecclesiastical domination over God's heritage, of all the silly outworks which the pride, the superstition, the knavery of mankind have erected around the citadel of our faith;

but the citadel itself is founded on a rock, the gates of hell cannot prevail against it, its master-builder is God; its beauty will be found ineffable, and its strength impregnable, when it shall be freed from the frippery of human ornaments, and cleared from the rubbish of human bulwarks.

It is no small part of the province of a teacher of Christianity, to distinguish between the word of God, and the additions which men have made to it The objections of unbelievers are frequently levelled against what is not Christianity, but mere human system; and he will be best able to defend the former, who is least studious to support the airy pretensions of the latter. The effect of established systems in obstructing truth, is to the last degree deplorable; every one sees it in other churches, but scarcely any one suspects it in his own. Calvin, I question not, thought it almost impossible that the Scriptures could ever have been so far perverted as to afford the Romanists any handle for their doctrine of transubstantiation, or that the understanding of any human being could have been so far debased, or rather so utterly annihilated, as to believe in it for a moment; yet this same Calvin followed St. Augustine in the doctrine of absolute personal reprobation and election, inculcating it as a fundamental article of faith, with nearly the same unchristian zeal, which infatuated him when he fastened Servetus to the stake. A thousand instances of this blind attachment to system might be taken from the ecclesiastical history of every century; indeed the whole of it is little more than the history of the struggles of different sects to overturn the systems of others, in order to build up *their own;* and the great lesson which every sect, and

every individual of every sect, ought to learn from its perusal, is—Moderation.

Want of genuine moderation towards those who differ from us in religious opinions, seems to be the most unaccountable thing in the world. Every man, who has any religion at all, feels within himself a stronger motive to judge right, than you can possibly suggest to him; and, if he judges wrong, what is that to you? To his own master he standeth or falleth; his wrong judgment may affect his own salvation, it cannot affect yours; for, in the words of Tertullian, *nec alii obest aut prodest alterius religio.* This you must admit, unless you think it your duty to instruct him; but instruction may be given with moderation; and considering that the Bible is as open to him as it is to you, you ought not to be over certain that it is your duty to press your instruction upon him; for what is, ordinarily speaking, your instruction, but an attempt to bring him over to your opinion? This principle should be received with great caution, or it may do much mischief; for it is on this principle that the Roman Catholics light up the fires of the inquisition, and compass sea and land to make a proselyte—a proselyte! to what we Protestants believe to be the delusion of Satan, the very canker of Christianity, the grand apostasy from the Gospel foretold by St. Paul. The Catholics however in this point act consistently; for, believing in the infallibility of their church, they have a plea for their zeal in bringing every one within its pale, which can never be urged by Protestants, with any shadow of justice and propriety.

There are many questions in divinity, in the investigating of which the mind fluctuates with an irksome

uncertainty, unable to perceive such a preponderance of argument as will warrant it in embracing as true, either the one side or the other. This hesitation arises, in many cases, from our not understanding the full meaning of the language, be it common or figurative, in which a doctrine is revealed. In some, it proceeds from our attempting to apprehend definitely, what is expressed indeterminately, or clearly, what God hath not thought proper clearly to reveal; in others, it is to be attributed to an indecision of temper, to which some men are peculiarly subject; but let it originate from what cause it may, it is far more tolerable than an arrogant temerity of judgment. A suspicion of fallibility would have been an useful principle to the professors of Christianity in every age; it would have choaked the spirit of persecution in its birth, and have rendered not only the church of Rome, but every church in Christendom, more shy of assuming to itself the proud title of Orthodox, and of branding every other with the opprobrious one of Heterodox, than any of them have hitherto been.

There are, you will say, doubtless, some fundamental doctrines in Christianity. Paul, the Apostle, has laid down one foundation; and he tells us, that *other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus, the Christ.* But this proposition, Jesus is the Messiah, includes, you will reply, several others, which are equally true. I acknowledge that it does so; and it is every man's duty to search the Scriptures, that he may know what those truths are; but I do not conceive it to be any man's duty to anathematize those, who cannot subscribe to *his* catalogue of fundamental *Christian* verities. That man is not to be esteemed an

Atheist, who acknowledges the existence of a God, the Creator of the universe, though he cannot assent to all the *truths* of natural religion, which *other* men may undertake to deduce from that principle; nor is he to be esteemed a Deist, who acknowledges that Jesus of Nazareth *is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world*, though he cannot assent to all the *truths* of revealed religion, which *other* men may think themselves warranted in deducing from thence. Still you will probably rejoin, there must be many truths in the Christian religion, concerning which no one ought to hesitate, inasmuch as, without a belief in them, he cannot be reputed a Christian. Reputed! by whom? By Jesus Christ his Lord and his God, or by you? Rash expositors of points of doubtful disputation; intolerant fabricators of metaphysical creeds, and incongruous systems of theology! Do you undertake to measure the extent of any man's understanding, except your own; to estimate the strength and origin of his habits of thinking; to appreciate his merit or demerit in the use of the talent which God has given him, so as unerringly to pronounce that the belief of this or that doctrine is necessary to his salvation? It is undoubtedly necessary to yours, if you are persuaded that it comes from God; but you take too much upon you, when you erect yourself into an infallible judge of truth and falsehood.

We, as Christians, are under no uncertainty as to the being of a God; as to his moral government of the world; as to the terms on which sinners may be reconciled to him; as to *the redemption that is in Jesus Christ;* as to a resurrection from the dead; as to a future state of retribution; nor with respect to other important questions, concerning which the wisest heathen philo-

sophers were either wholly ignorant, or had no settled notions. But there are other subjects on which the *Academicorum* ἐποχή may be admitted, I apprehend, without injuring the foundations of our religion; such are the questions which relate to the power of evil spirits to suspend the laws of nature, or to actuate the minds of men; to the materiality or immateriality of the human soul; the state of the dead before the general resurrection; the resurrection of the same body; the duration of future punishments; and many others of the same kind. Some one will think that I here speak too freely, and accuse me, probably, as an encourager of sceptical and latitudinarian principles. What! Shall the church of Christ never be freed from the narrow-minded contentions of bigots; from the insults of men who know not what spirit they are of, when they would stint the Omnipotent in the exercise of his mercy, and bar the doors of heaven against every sect but their own? Shall we never learn to think more humbly of ourselves, and less despicably of others; to believe that the Father of the universe accommodates not his judgments to the wretched wranglings of pedantic theologues; but that every one, who, with an honest intention, and to the best of his ability seeketh the truth, whether he findeth it or not, and worketh righteousness, will be accepted of him?

I have no regard for latitudinarian principles, nor for any principles, but the principles of truth; and truth every man must endeavour to investigate for himself; and, ordinarily speaking, he will be most successful in his endeavours, who examines, with candour and care, what can be urged on each side of a greatly controverted question. This sort of examination may, in

some instances, produce a doubt, a hesitation, a diffident suspension of judgment; but it will at the same time produce mutual forbearance and good temper towards those who differ from us; our charity will be enlarged, as our understanding is improved. Partial examination is the parent of pertinacity of opinion; and a froward propensity to be angry with those who question the validity of our principles, or deny the justness of our conclusions, in any matter respecting philosophy, policy, or religion, is an infallible mark of prejudice; of our having grounded our opinions on fashion, fancy, interest; on the unexamined tenets of our family, sect, or party; on any thing rather than on the solid foundation of cool and dispassionate reasoning. *Iliacos intra muros peccatur et extra.* Churchmen as well as dissenters, and dissenters as well as churchmen, are apt to give a degree of assent to opinions beyond what they can give a reason for; this is the very essence of prejudice; it is difficult for any man entirely to divest himself of all prejudice, but he may surely take care that it be not accompanied with an uncharitable propensity to stigmatize with reproachful appellations, those who cannot measure the rectitude of the Divine dispensations by his rule, nor seek their way to heaven, by insisting on the path which he, in his overweening wisdom, has arrogantly prescribed as the only one which can lead men thither.

This intolerant spirit has abated much of its violence in the course of this century amongst ourselves; we pray to God that it may be utterly extinguished in every part of Christendom, and that the true spirit of Christianity, which is the spirit of meekness, peace, and love, may be introduced in its stead. If different

men, in carefully and conscientiously examining the Scriptures, should arrive at different conclusions, even on points of the last importance; we trust that God, who alone knows what every man is capable of, will be merciful to him that is in error. We trust that he will pardon the Unitarian, if he be in an error, because he has fallen into it from the dread of becoming an idolater, of giving that glory to another which he conceives to be due to God alone. If the worshipper of Jesus Christ be in an error, we trust that God will pardon his mistake, because he has fallen into it from a dread of disobeying what he conceives to be *revealed* concerning the *nature* of the Son, or *commanded* concerning the *honour* to be given him. Both are actuated by the same principle—THE FEAR OF GOD; and, though that principle impels them into different roads, it is our hope and belief, that, if they add to their faith charity, they will meet in heaven. If any one thinks differently on the subject, I will have no contention with him; for I feel no disposition to proselyte others to any opinion of mine; esteeming it a duty to speak what I think, I have no scruple in doing that; but to do more is to affect a tyranny over other men's minds; it is to encounter not only the reason, but the passions, prejudices, and interests of mankind; it is to engage in a conflict, in which Christian charity seldom escapes unhurt on either side.

Sparks' Theological Collection.

We regard the third number of this work, which is now before the public, as equal in interest to either of the two preceding. It comprises *Whitby's Last*

Thoughts, and *Bishop Hare's Letter on the Difficulties and Discouragements which attend the Study of the Scriptures.*

The former work has long been esteemed, by those who have been able to obtain it, for its remarkable candour and moderation, as well as for its learning, and its strength of argument. Owing, however, partly to the extreme plainness of the style, partly to the want of significant divisions of its subjects, partly to the abundance of its learning, and partly perhaps to the nature of the sentiments avowed, its editions have been few, its circulation has been confined, and it has been rarely that a copy of it appeared to gratify the search of the student. On these accounts we were glad to see it republished in the present Collection; and we are of opinion that the thanks of every reader are due to Mr. Sparks, for so greatly facilitating its perusal, by dividing it into sections with appropriate heads. This service can be duly estimated by those, who know how excessively wearisome it is to plod along through a book, which requires entire application of the mind, without coming to any resting place, or receiving any intimation concerning the way which remains before them. It is like travelling through a strange country, where there are neither inns, milestones, nor guideboards; where the traveller must pitch his own tent, light his own fire, reckon his own distance, and find out his road by himself. As small a matter as it may appear, we have not the least doubt, that the practice of dividing books into sections and chapters is one of the greatest exciting aids to the general diffusion of knowledge. We are pretty sure, that in case this expedient were never employed, there would not be half the num-

Round a vaster Sun.
"Our Father who art in Heaven."

In all these worlds, illumining and illumined,
Dwell Spirits, in powers unequal, and in forms;
But all believe in God, in God rejoice.
"Hallowed be thy name."

He the high exalted One,
Who alone can wholly know himself,
Wholly in himself rejoice,
Formed the proposed design
For the bliss of all who inhabit his worlds.
"For us may thy kingdom come."

Well for them, that He, not they,
Ordered the present for them, and the future;
Well for them, well!
Well too for us!
"Thy will be done
"On earth, as it is in Heaven."

He lifts with the stalk the ear on high;
Ripens the golden apple, the purple grape;
Feeds on the hillock the lamb, the roe in the forest;
And yet his thunder rolls along;
And the hailstone destroyeth
On the stalk, on the branch, on the hill, and in the
forest.
"Give us this day our daily bread."

Can it be, that high o'er the thunder's path,
Sinners too, and mortals exist?

ber of readers, even of novels and romances, that there is at present.

Whitby's Last Thoughts are the matured convictions of a man, whose researches had produced a change in his religious belief, and whose candour and singleness of heart prompted an avowal of the change to the world. His Commentary on the New Testament has been before the public more than a century, and it is still considered one of the best which we have. When he published it, he was a believer in the doctrine of the Trinity, as many passages will show; but he afterwards was persuaded of the erroneousness of his sentiments, and was not backward in producing his arguments for what appeared to him a sounder faith. Let any one, therefore, who would support a belief in the Trinity by the authority of Whitby's Commentary, turn to the Last, and as we should say, better Thoughts, of the same writer, and see whether a contrary doctrine is not more powerfully supported there.

Hare's Letter has been pronounced the best piece of irony in the language; and, being of a more popular character, is better known than its companion in this number, the work of Whitby.

A PSALM.

Translated from Klopstock.

Round planets wander moons;
Planets round suns;
The armies of the suns do wander

Round a vaster Sun.
"Our Father who art in Heaven."

In all these worlds, illumining and illumined,
Dwell Spirits, in powers unequal, and in forms;
But all believe in God, in God rejoice.
"Hallowed be thy name."

He the high exalted One,
Who alone can wholly know himself,
Wholly in himself rejoice,
Formed the proposed design
For the bliss of all who inhabit his worlds.
"For us may thy kingdom come."

Well for them, that He, not they,
Ordered the present for them, and the future;
Well for them, well!
Well too for us!
"Thy will be done
"On earth, as it is in Heaven."

He lifts with the stalk the ear on high;
Ripens the golden apple, the purple grape;
Feeds on the hillock the lamb, the roe in the forest;
And yet his thunder rolls along;
And the hailstone destroyeth
On the stalk, on the branch, on the hill, and in the
forest.
"Give us this day our daily bread."

Can it be, that high o'er the thunder's path,
Sinners too, and mortals exist?

That there the friend is changed to a foe?
And friends in death's division part?
"Forgive us our guilt,
"As we forgive our debtors."

Various paths conduct to the lofty end,
On to felicity.
Some of them bend through solitudes,—
Yet even in them there gushes a spring of joy,
And the thirsty refreshes.
"Lead us not into temptation,
"But deliver us from evil."

Worship to Thee, by whom the vaster sun
With suns, and planets, and moons, was surrounded;
Who spirits created;
Their happiness ordered;
The ear doth uplift;
Who commandeth death;
To the end through solitudes leadeth, refreshing the wanderer;
Worship to THEE!
"For thine is the power, and the kingdom,
"And the glory. Amen."

Plainness of the Christian Doctrines.

From Whitby's Last Thoughts.

Now, from this principle, that a rule prescribed by an all wise God, to teach the most simple, rude, and ignorant, as well as the wise and prudent, what is necessary for them to believe, and do, in order to salva-

tion, must be plain, and easy to be understood, by the most simple and illiterate, it follows,

First, That it is repugnant to the wisdom of God, to require any thing as necessary to be believed, which is dubious, and obscure in Scripture; since that would be to propound that as a means for obtaining an end, which he knew to be insufficient to obtain it; it being certain, that what is dubious and obscure in Scripture, cannot afford us a certain knowledge of our duty.

Secondly, It also seems repugnant to the goodness of God, to perplex and confound weak minds with such subtilties, for the knowledge of which he has not given them suitable qualifications. Seeing, as St. Paul observes, "God accepteth, according to what a man hath and not according to that he hath not." 2 Cor. viii. 12. Now it is evident, from the continual clashings of our most learned divines about these subtilties, that the illiterate can have no certain knowledge of the truth or falsehood of them.

Thirdly, It seemeth inconsistent with the justice and righteousness of God, to require any man to believe what he does not, and cannot, understand; for no man can be said to believe, that is, assent to, what he does not understand; because assent is an act of the understanding, and we must understand the meaning of every term in a proposition, before we can assent to it, or dissent from it; for words of which we do not understand the meaning, are the same to us as if they had no signification at all. A righteous God puts upon no man the Egyptian task, "of making brick without straw," nor requires any thing of us in order to our salvation, which we cannot perform; that being in effect to require impossible conditions of salvation from us.

Unitarian Fund Society.

For several years past, a Society has been in extensive operation in England, called the *Unitarian Fund.* A separate journal of its proceedings has lately been commenced, which is usually prefixed to the respective numbers of the Monthly Repository, and denominated the Unitarian Fund Register.

The purposes of this Society, as expressed in its last Report, are to provide and assist missionary labours; to encourage village preaching, and lectures by ministers resident in the neighbourhood; to assist particular congregations; to aid in the distribution of tracts; and to keep up foreign correspondence and co-operation. Mr. Richard Wright, to whom the cause of Unitarianism owes so much, has been employed as a missionary for the last twelve years under the patronage of the Society. His success has been great, and numerous congregations have been collected by his preaching. Several other missionaries, also, have rendered distinguished services.

By the liberality of numerous contributors, the funds of the Society are ample, and they seem to be appropriated with discretion and generosity. Many small congregations receive from them essential aid. A grant of one hundred pounds sterling is allowed annually to William Roberts, the native Unitarian preacher at Madras. This is applied to defray the expenses of public worship, schools, and printing. In a letter, Roberts mentions the works, which he had prepared for the press, as follows. A Collection of Texts containing the Principal Doctrines and Duties of Religion; One *Hundred* and Fifteen Questions to the Roman Cathe-

lics; A Dialogue between an Idolist and a Worshipper of God; Heathenism Weighed, in Verse and Prose; Corruptions of Christianity The Worship of the Holy Scriptures contrasted with the Worship of the Church of England; A Dialogue between a Trinitarian and Unitarian on the principal Texts of Scripture, which are thought to support the Doctrine of the Trinity; Notes on the Gospels and Acts. These works are written in the language of the natives, and are chiefly designed for the benefit of Roberts's congregation.

Scripture Lessons.

W. B. Fowle, of Boston, has published a Selection from the Old and New Testament, for the use of schools, which we think admirably well adapted to its purpose. It is an improvement on a Selection, already well known. The most striking and intelligible portions of Scripture are brought together, and arranged under three parts; the first, containing Historical Selections from the Old Testament; the second, Lessons on our duty toward God and man, from various parts of the Scriptures; and the third, Selections from the Evangelists and Acts of the Apostles.

Installation at Medford.

On Wednesday, the ninth of July last, the Rev. Andrew Bigelow was installed over the Congregational Society in Medford, as successor to the late Dr. Osgood. The services on this occasion were as follows. Introductory prayer by Rev. Charles Brooks, of Hingham; Sermon by Rev. Dr. Bancroft, of Worcester; Prayer

sophers were either wholly ignorant, or had no settled notions. But there are other subjects on which the *Academicorum* εποχη may be admitted, I apprehend, without injuring the foundations of our religion; such are the questions which relate to the power of evil spirits to suspend the laws of nature, or to actuate the minds of men; to the materiality or immateriality of the human soul; the state of the dead before the general resurrection; the resurrection of the same body; the duration of future punishments; and many others of the same kind. Some one will think that I here speak too freely, and accuse me, probably, as an encourager of sceptical and latitudinarian principles. What! Shall the church of Christ never be freed from the narrow-minded contentions of bigots; from the insults of men who know not what spirit they are of, when they would stint the Omnipotent in the exercise of his mercy, and bar the doors of heaven against every sect but their own? Shall we never learn to think more humbly of ourselves, and less despicably of others; to believe that the Father of the universe accommodates not his judgments to the wretched wranglings of pedantic theologues; but that every one, who, with an honest intention, and to the best of his ability seeketh the truth, whether he findeth it or not, and worketh righteousness, will be accepted of him?

I have no regard for latitudinarian principles, nor for any principles, but the principles of truth; and truth every man must endeavour to investigate for himself; and, ordinarily speaking, he will be most successful in his endeavours, who examines, with candour and care, what can be urged on each side of a greatly controverted question. This sort of examination may, in

some instances, produce a doubt, a hesitation, a diffident suspension of judgment; but it will at the same time produce mutual forbearance and good temper towards those who differ from us; our charity will be enlarged, as our understanding is improved. Partial examination is the parent of pertinacity of opinion; and a froward propensity to be angry with those who question the validity of our principles, or deny the justness of our conclusions, in any matter respecting philosophy, policy, or religion, is an infallible mark of prejudice; of our having grounded our opinions on fashion, fancy, interest; on the unexamined tenets of our family, sect, or party; on any thing rather than on the solid foundation of cool and dispassionate reasoning. *Iliacos intra muros peccatur et extra.* Churchmen as well as dissenters, and dissenters as well as churchmen, are apt to give a degree of assent to opinions beyond what they can give a reason for; this is the very essence of prejudice; it is difficult for any man entirely to divest himself of all prejudice, but he may surely take care that it be not accompanied with an uncharitable propensity to stigmatize with reproachful appellations, those who cannot measure the rectitude of the Divine dispensations by his rule, nor seek their way to heaven, by insisting on the path which he, in his overweening wisdom, has arrogantly prescribed as the only one which can lead men thither.

This intolerant spirit has abated much of its violence in the course of this century amongst ourselves; we pray to God that it may be utterly extinguished in every part of Christendom, and that the true spirit of Christianity, which is the spirit of meekness, peace, and love, may be introduced in its stead. If different

men, in carefully and conscientiously examining the Scriptures, should arrive at different conclusions, even on points of the last importance; we trust that God, who alone knows what every man is capable of, will be merciful to him that is in error. We trust that he will pardon the Unitarian, if he be in an error, because he has fallen into it from the dread of becoming an idolater, of giving that glory to another which he conceives to be due to God alone. If the worshipper of Jesus Christ be in an error, we trust that God will pardon his mistake, because he has fallen into it from a dread of disobeying what he conceives to be *revealed* concerning the *nature* of the Son, or *commanded* concerning the *honour* to be given him. Both are actuated by the same principle—THE FEAR OF GOD; and, though that principle impels them into different roads, it is our hope and belief, that, if they add to their faith charity, they will meet in heaven. If any one thinks differently on the subject, I will have no contention with him; for I feel no disposition to proselyte others to any opinion of mine; esteeming it a duty to speak what I think, I have no scruple in doing that; but to do more is to affect a tyranny over other men's minds; it is to encounter not only the reason, but the passions, prejudices, and interests of mankind; it is to engage in a conflict, in which Christian charity seldom escapes unhurt on either side.

Sparks' Theological Collection.

We regard the third number of this work, which is now before the public, as equal in interest to either of the two preceding. It comprises *Whitby's Last*

Thoughts, and *Bishop Hare's Letter on the Difficulties and Discouragements which attend the Study of the Scriptures.*

The former work has long been esteemed, by those who have been able to obtain it, for its remarkable candour and moderation, as well as for its learning, and its strength of argument. Owing, however, partly to the extreme plainness of the style, partly to the want of significant divisions of its subjects, partly to the abundance of its learning, and partly perhaps to the nature of the sentiments avowed, its editions have been few, its circulation has been confined, and it has been rarely that a copy of it appeared to gratify the search of the student. On these accounts we were glad to see it republished in the present Collection; and we are of opinion that the thanks of every reader are due to Mr. Sparks, for so greatly facilitating its perusal, by dividing it into sections with appropriate heads. This service can be duly estimated by those, who know how excessively wearisome it is to plod along through a book, which requires entire application of the mind, without coming to any resting place, or receiving any intimation concerning the way which remains before them. It is like travelling through a strange country, where there are neither inns, milestones, nor guideboards; where the traveller must pitch his own tent, light his own fire, reckon his own distance, and find out his road by himself. As small a matter as it may appear, we have not the least doubt, that the practice of dividing books into sections and chapters is one of the greatest exciting aids to the general diffusion of knowledge. We are pretty sure, that in case this expedient were never employed, there would not be half the num-

ber of readers, even of novels and romances, that there is at present.

Whitby's Last Thoughts are the matured convictions of a man, whose researches had produced a change in his religious belief, and whose candour and singleness of heart prompted an avowal of the change to the world. His Commentary on the New Testament has been before the public more than a century, and it is still considered one of the best which we have. When he published it, he was a believer in the doctrine of the Trinity, as many passages will show; but he afterwards was persuaded of the erroneousness of his sentiments, and was not backward in producing his arguments for what appeared to him a sounder faith. Let any one, therefore, who would support a belief in the Trinity by the authority of Whitby's Commentary, turn to the Last, and as we should say, better Thoughts, of the same writer, and see whether a contrary doctrine is not more powerfully supported there.

Hare's Letter has been pronounced the best piece of irony in the language; and, being of a more popular character, is better known than its companion in this number, the work of Whitby.

A PSALM.

Translated from Klopstock.

Round planets wander moons;
Planets round suns;
The armies of the suns do wander

Round a vaster Sun.
"Our Father who art in Heaven."

In all these worlds, illumining and illumined,
Dwell Spirits, in powers unequal, and in forms;
But all believe in God, in God rejoice.
"Hallowed be thy name."

He the high exalted One,
Who alone can wholly know himself,
Wholly in himself rejoice,
Formed the proposed design
For the bliss of all who inhabit his worlds.
"For us may thy kingdom come."

Well for them, that He, not they,
Ordered the present for them, and the future;
Well for them, well!
Well too for us!
"Thy will be done
"On earth, as it is in Heaven."

He lifts with the stalk the ear on high;
Ripens the golden apple, the purple grape;
Feeds on the hillock the lamb, the roe in the forest;
And yet his thunder rolls along;
And the hailstone destroyeth
On the stalk, on the branch, on the hill, and in the forest.
"Give us this day our daily bread."

Can it be, that high o'er the thunder's path,
Sinners too, and mortals exist?

That there the friend is changed to a foe?
And friends in death's division part?
"Forgive us our guilt,
"As we forgive our debtors."

Various paths conduct to the lofty end,
On to felicity.
Some of them bend through solitudes,—
Yet even in them there gushes a spring of joy,
And the thirsty refreshes.
"Lead us not into temptation,
"But deliver us from evil."

Worship to Thee, by whom the vaster sun
With suns, and planets, and moons, was surrounded;
Who spirits created;
Their happiness ordered;
The ear doth uplift;
Who commandeth death;
To the end through solitudes leadeth, refreshing the wanderer;
Worship to THEE!
"For thine is the power, and the kingdom,
"And the glory. Amen."

Plainness of the Christian Doctrines.

From Whitby's Last Thoughts.

Now, from this principle, that a rule prescribed by an all wise God, to teach the most simple, rude, and ignorant, as well as the wise and prudent, what is necessary for them to believe, and do, in order to salva-

tion, must be plain, and easy to be understood, by the most simple and illiterate, it follows,

First, That it is repugnant to the wisdom of God, to require any thing as necessary to be believed, which is dubious, and obscure in Scripture; since that would be to propound that as a means for obtaining an end, which he knew to be insufficient to obtain it; it being certain, that what is dubious and obscure in Scripture, cannot afford us a certain knowledge of our duty.

Secondly, It also seems repugnant to the goodness of God, to perplex and confound weak minds with such subtilties, for the knowledge of which he has not given them suitable qualifications. Seeing, as St. Paul observes, "God accepteth, according to what a man hath and not according to that he hath not." 2 Cor. viii. 12. Now it is evident, from the continual clashings of our most learned divines about these subtilties, that the illiterate can have no certain knowledge of the truth or falsehood of them.

Thirdly, It seemeth inconsistent with the justice and righteousness of God, to require any man to believe what he does not, and cannot, understand; for no man can be said to believe, that is, assent to, what he does not understand; because assent is an act of the understanding, and we must understand the meaning of every term in a proposition, before we can assent to it, or dissent from it; for words of which we do not understand the meaning, are the same to us as if they had no signification at all. A righteous God puts upon no man the Egyptian task, "of making brick without straw," nor requires any thing of us in order to our salvation, which we cannot perform; that being in effect to require impossible conditions of salvation from us.

Unitarian Fund Society.

For several years past, a Society has been in extensive operation in England, called the *Unitarian Fund.* A separate journal of its proceedings has lately been commenced, which is usually prefixed to the respective numbers of the Monthly Repository, and denominated the Unitarian Fund Register.

The purposes of this Society, as expressed in its last Report, are to provide and assist missionary labours; to encourage village preaching, and lectures by ministers resident in the neighbourhood; to assist particular congregations; to aid in the distribution of tracts; and to keep up foreign correspondence and co-operation. Mr. Richard Wright, to whom the cause of Unitarianism owes so much, has been employed as a missionary for the last twelve years under the patronage of the Society. His success has been great, and numerous congregations have been collected by his preaching. Several other missionaries, also, have rendered distinguished services.

By the liberality of numerous contributors, the funds of the Society are ample, and they seem to be appropriated with discretion and generosity. Many small congregations receive from them essential aid. A grant of one hundred pounds sterling is allowed annually to William Roberts, the native Unitarian preacher at Madras. This is applied to defray the expenses of public worship, schools, and printing. In a letter, Roberts mentions the works, which he had prepared for the press, as follows. A Collection of Texts containing the Principal Doctrines and Duties of Religion; One Hundred and Fifteen Questions to the Roman Cathe-

lics; A Dialogue between an Idolist and a Worshipper of God; Heathenism Weighed, in Verse and Prose; Corruptions of Christianity The Worship of the Holy Scriptures contrasted with the Worship of the Church of England; A Dialogue between a Trinitarian and Unitarian on the principal Texts of Scripture, which are thought to support the Doctrine of the Trinity; Notes on the Gospels and Acts. These works are written in the language of the natives, and are chiefly designed for the benefit of Roberts's congregation.

Scripture Lessons.

W. B. Fowle, of Boston, has published a Selection from the Old and New Testament, for the use of schools, which we think admirably well adapted to its purpose. It is an improvement on a Selection, already well known. The most striking and intelligible portions of Scripture are brought together, and arranged under three parts; the first, containing Historical Selections from the Old Testament; the second, Lessons on our duty toward God and man, from various parts of the Scriptures; and the third, Selections from the Evangelists and Acts of the Apostles.

Installation at Medford.

On Wednesday, the ninth of July last, the Rev. Andrew Bigelow was installed over the Congregational Society in Medford, as successor to the late Dr. Osgood. The services on this occasion were as follows. Introductory prayer by Rev. Charles Brooks, of Hingham; Sermon by Rev. Dr. Bancroft, of Worcester; Prayer

of Installation by Rev. Dr. Holmes, of Cambridge; Charge by Rev. Dr. Ripley, of Concord; Fellowship of the Churches by Rev. James Walker, of Charlestown; Concluding Prayer by Rev. Convers Francis, of Watertown.

A WORK has just been published by Wells and Lilly, Boston, entitled *An Inquiry into the Comparative moral Tendency of Trinitarian and Unitarian Doctrines.* BY JARED SPARKS. This work comprises the substance of the letters to Dr. Miller, published from time to time in the Unitarian Miscellany. The following is an extract from the preface. "In preparing these letters for separate publication, the author deemed it advisable to omit some parts, to write others anew, to interweave occasional additions, and, by removing as far as possible local and personal allusions, to clothe them with a general interest, and cause them to harmonize in illustrating the point which he aims to discuss." Five new letters are added, making about one third of the whole, and many important additions are made to nearly all the original letters; especially to those on the christian name, the trinity, the doctrines of restoration and annihilation, the calvinistic scheme, and the sentiments of Newton, Locke, and Watts. In its present form the work contains four hundred and eighteen pages, and embraces an extended view of the comparative moral influence of unitarian and orthodox opinions.

THE

UNITARIAN MISCELLANY

AND

CHRISTIAN MONITOR.

No. XXXIV.] OCTOBER, 1823. [Vol. V.

Christ in the Form of God.

A PASSAGE in Paul's Epistle to the Philippians is quoted by trinitarians, and frequently with much confidence, in support of their doctrine. It is that in which Christ is said to have been in the form of God. This phrase, and one or two others connected with it, are supposed to imply, that the Apostle intended to represent Christ the Son to be the same as God the Father. We will quote the passage, and then endeavour to ascertain its meaning. The Apostle is enjoining love, concord, and humility on the Philippians, and to encourage them in these virtues, and especially the last, he calls their attention to the example of their divine master.

"Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became

obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Philip. ii. 6—9.

These words are often adduced as teaching the deity of Christ, and affording an argument in favour of the trinity. Before we proceed to investigate the actual sense of the passage, let us see with what show of consistency, when taken literally as it stands, it can be imagined to inculcate the notion of the equality and identity of the Father and Son.

First, it is an unheard of use of language to speak of a person being in the form of himself. If Christ were truly the Supreme God, the same in essence and substance, the Apostle would have called him God. One thing, or person, may be said to have the form of another, when there is a general resemblance between them; but to say, that a person, or thing, is in the form of itself, is to use words without import, a species of trifling with which the Apostle can hardly be charged.

Secondly, to assert the existence of any being in the universe, who is equal to the Supreme God, is plainly to assert a plurality of Gods. To whatever degree of power and excellence you may elevate the Supreme Being, whenever you make another being equal to him, this being must be equally exalted, equally perfect. Hence, if the text actually teach, that Christ is in all respects equal to the Almighty Father, it teaches the doctrine of two Gods.

Thirdly, nor can this consequence be evaded by the supposition, that these two equal Gods are one and the same God, for such a supposition itself involves an absurdity. Two supreme beings cannot be one, any more *than two* men can be one. Besides, a being cannot be

said to be equal to itself; equality necessarily implies more than one; and the very form of expression, that Christ is equal to God, indicates that he is not the same being.

Fourthly, suppose it to be true, that he were equal to God, with what propriety could it be called *robbery* to assume this equality? There can be no meaning in such language. God possesses all perfections and cannot rob himself of any thing; and, if Christ be truly God, what is here said about robbery is equally futile in sense, and derogatory to his character.

Fifthly, if to be in the *form of God* means, that Christ was truly God, it must be inferred from his being in the *form of a servant*, that he was literally a servant. The two expressions have the same import, and ought to be taken in the same extent. That is, the God of all things is made to resign the government of the universe, and descend to the degrading condition of a servant or slave among men. What mind does not revolt at such a representation? Are we told of two natures? This is a convenient subterfuge and nothing more. Where is any thing said of two natures? What is more evident in the present passage, than that Christ is spoken of throughout as one and the same being, possessed of one and the same nature? Moreover, in whatever nature it was that he humbled himself, it was in that nature, which made him in the form of God; but if in this nature he were truly God, how could he humble himself? God is infinite in every perfection; these perfections cannot be diminished or humbled, without destroying his character as God. It follows, that the nature of Christ was not the nature of God in any sense; and that the notion of two natures is not

less inconsistent with the sense of the text, than absurd in itself.

Sixthly, the trinitarian interpretation of this passage is at variance with the spirit and purpose of the context. The Apostle is inculcating humility, and cites the example of Christ. But does it imply any humility in Christ to say, that he thought it not robbery to be equal with God? On the contrary, could any thing be farther removed from the true characteristics of humility? What could argue a higher presumption and self consequence, than to claim equality with God?

From these considerations, two things are manifest. The first is, that, whatever may be the meaning of the passage, the trinitarian interpretation is erroneous; and the second, that the passage itself in the common translation is inconsistent in its parts. This will be more obvious by a further examination.

As to the phrase, *form of God*, we have already seen, that it cannot signify the essence, or nature of God. Except in this passage the word here rendered *form* occurs only once in the New Testament. "After that, he appeared in another *form* unto two of them, as they walked and went into the country." Mark, xvi. 12. No one will suppose from these words, that he came in another nature, or as another being. He only assumed a different external appearance from that in which he had previously appeared to Mary Magdalene, who took him for a gardner. So in the present instance, the word must mean a resemblance of some sort, either real or figurative, and not an identity of nature. In this respect it has an appropriate signification, and one illustrative of the character of the Saviour.

He sustained the form, or resemblance of God, in his glory and excellence. He was highly exalted, and received more abundantly the divine gifts than any other being. In knowledge, wisdom, and holiness, in every moral attribute and perfection, he resembled God. In the power he possessed, in the command he had over nature and men, in his miracles, and in all his works of benevolence and love, compassion and mercy, he was in the form of God. In all the marks of excellence, which distinguished him so highly, he approached the perfections, and bore the likeness of his heavenly Father.*

Next, in regard to the phrase, *thought it not robbery to be equal with God*, it is a faulty translation. This is plain from its very import, as hinted above, unless

* Εν μορφη Θεου, *in the form of God*, Hesychius defines μορφη by ιδεα, ειδος; and Schleusner's definition is, *forma, omne quod in occulos occurrit, imago, similitudo.* It denotes the appearance of a thing, as distinct from its internal essence or nature. It is thus several times used in the Septuagint. Εποιησεν αυτο ως μορφην ανδρος, *he made it after the form, or figure, of a man.* Isai. xliv. 13. Και ἡ μορφη σου μη αλλοιουσθω, *and let not thy form, or appearance, be changed.* Dan. v. 10. In this sense the word is five times found in the book of Daniel. Hammond has endeavoured to prove, that the word is used by good authors, *pro interna ipsa rerum essentia vel forma;* but the labour with which he has pursued this undertaking evinces its difficulty. And after all, he has done no more, than render it probable, that the word has been sometimes thus employed in a figurative and loose sense, and as an exception to its customary use. And Le Clerc has well observed, that admitting his deductions to be accurate, it does not follow, that the word here has the signification, which he endeavours to prove it capable of admitting. Quamvis id significaret quod vult noster, non sequeretur in hac phrasi idem sonare. *Vid. Adnotat. in Loc.* In the Notes to his Translation of the New Testament, Le Clerc says the phrase means *la ressemblance de Dieu*, the resemblance of God.

we are willing to charge the Apostle with having used words without meaning, as well as in contradiction to his chief design. Why should it be said, that Christ thought it not robbery to be what he was necessarily by nature; or why should the assumption of equality with the Supreme God be adduced as an evidence of humility? Let the text be rightly translated, and no room will be left for these unanswerable questions, nor will any darkness rest on the language of the Apostle. "Christ, being in the form of God, did not consider this likeness to God as a booty, eagerly to be retained." In other words, although he possessed those extraordinary powers, which gave him so strong a resemblance to God, yet he was not disposed to claim them as his own, nor was he forward to make such a display of them as to indicate, that he felt himself exalted above other men.*

* There is a difference of opinion among the learned concerning the signification of the word ἁρπαγμος, translated *robbery* in the common version. Very few critics, however, contend for this meaning in its present connexion. It is susceptible of a passive and an active sense. It may mean the act of plundering, or the thing plundered, the act of seizing or the thing seized. As defined by Schleusner, it is either *ipsa rapiendi actio*, or *res avidè diripienda*. In the present instance it seems to have the latter sense, as expressed in the Vulgate translation, which has it, *non rapinam arbitratus est*, he did not think it *plunder*. That is, he did not wish to retain his likeness to God as a thing, which he had forcibly seized, and of which he held an undoubted possession; but as it was entirely the gift of God, he was willing to be divested of it except so far as it should be requisite to accomplish the great object of his mission.

That learned critic and commentator, Mr. Peirce, says, "I cannot but add what I think very material, that not one of the primitive christians, who lived before the Council of Nice, as far as appears, understood this phrase in the same way that our translators do." Le Clerc translates the verse as follows; *Etant en forme de Dieu, il ne*

This sense of the text is in perfect harmony with what follows. He "made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant." That is, instead of being elated with his vast superiority above all other men, and using his miraculous powers to give him worldly eminence, he voluntarily brought himself down to a level with persons of the humblest condition, with whom he lived and conversed. He laid aside the greatness of his power, and veiled the brightness of his glory, and not only dwelt with the poor and unfortunate, but submitted to the same circumstances, and endured the same privations. Nor did he stop here; but, for the good of mankind, he suffered reproach and persecution, and yielded to a cruel and ignominious death.*

crut pas que s'égaler à Dieu fût une chose qu'on pût ravir. Wetstein ascribes to ἁρπαγμος the same meaning as Schleusner.

As to the phrase ισα Θεῳ, rendered in the common version, *equal to God*, Whitby says it means, "to be, or to appear, as God, or in the likeness of God;" and he adds, that the word ισα is frequently used adverbially. This he proves by many quotations from the Septuagint. Schlictingius had before done the same. *Neutrum plurale more Graecorum adverbialiter capitur. Latini dicerent, quod esset ceu Deus, aut aeque ac Deus, vel instar Dei.* Vid. Schlict. Comment. in loc. Macknight follows Whitby, and Rosenmuller agrees with Schlictingius. This sense of the word takes away the absurdity of making another being equal to God, and thus giving countenance to the doctrine of two Gods. Likeness, or resemblance, admits of comparison, and however nearly one being may approach to another in this respect, it does not necessarily follow that they are equal.

* The phrase ἑαυτον εκενωσε, *he made himself of no reputation*, means literally, *he emptied, or divested himself.* That is, he divested himself of his resemblance to God, or refrained from an ostentatious exercise of those miraculous powers, in which this likeness to God consisted.

Taking the form of a servant, μορφην δουλου λαβων. Instead

These features in the character and life of our Saviour are brought to the minds of the Philippians, as a testimony of his humility, and as affording an illustrious example for them to follow. In connexion with the two preceding verses, the passage under consideration may be thus paraphrased.

"Let nothing be done among you in the spirit of contention and vain glory, but let each one cherish modesty and humility, esteeming others better than himself. Let no one be devoted exclusively to his own interests, but rather let every one contribute to the benefit of others. Preserve the same temper and disposition, which prevailed in Christ, who, although he resembled God in his extraordinary powers and qualities, yet he did not consider these gifts as his own, nor did he use them to promote selfish motives, or to show his ascendency above others. He even refrained from any exercise of his miraculous powers on his own account, divested himself of his greatness, and became in appearance like other men. He descended to the humblest offices of life, was familiar with poverty and grief, and at last, to accomplish his great purpose of benevolence to men, he voluntarily suffered death by the wicked hands of his persecutors."

To conclude, among the controverted texts it may be doubted whether there be one, which can with less propriety than this be forced into a sanction of the trinitarian doctrine. As far as it proves any thing on the

of assuming the control over others, which his dignity and power enabled him to assume, and instead of seeking his own elevation and aggrandizement, he walked in the humble ranks of life, condescending to the offices, and submitting to the treatment of a servant.

subject, it is, that the Son is a distinct being from the Father, and of a subordinate nature.

A.

Creeds the Source of Intolerance.

From Sparks's Inquiry.

To the passion for established Confessions may be attributed the propensity, so common among christians, of calling harsh names, applying reproachful epithets, and charging their brethren with heresy and unbelief. It is observable, that they who are the most rigidly wedded to forms of faith, have usually been the first to commence the outcry of heresy, and the most relentless in pursuing the unfortunate delinquent. The reason is obvious. While they are guided by human forms, why should they not condemn all persons as infidels, who persist in acknowledging assent to the Bible only? Was any man ever denounced as a heretic for not believing in the Bible? Not one. Martyrs have been tried by creeds, and condemned for denying creeds. They have suffered for the constancy of their faith in the Scriptures. Does not every church employ the term heretic to denote one, who rejects its assumed articles? Does not that, which makes a heretic in one church, make a saint in another? Judge every man by the Bible alone, and you will have no further occasion to torture his conscience and blacken his character with the hideous terrors of excommunications, anathemas, and cruel aspersions on the charge of heresy.

I speak not of the original meaning of the word, but of its popular use, or rather abuse. Every person,

charged with heresy, professes a firm and sincere belief in the Gospel. Otherwise he would not be a heretic, but an infidel. His accusers call him a heretic, not because he does not believe the Bible, but because he cannot believe it as they do. He is a heretic in the eyes of Calvinists, because, perhaps, he does not believe one of the five points; of Arminians, because he believes them all; of Baptists, because he sprinkles infants; of Congregationalists, because he does not sprinkle them; of Presbyterians, because he believes in bishops; of Churchmen, because he does not believe in them. And so we are all heretics to one another, and yet the faith and hopes of all centre in the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Is it said, that in accusations of heresy, the accuser always understands the term to indicate a deficiency of faith in the Scriptures? Let this be granted, and the case is not altered. The accused tells you that he *does* believe the Scriptures, and what better authority can be had, than his own declaration? May we not justly consider the enforcement of a charge, under such circumstances, as the wickedest persecution? Why is he to be branded with an odious epithet for valuing his faith as dearly as another, who may rashly accuse him of being a heretic, for maintaining his independence and a clear conscience? Abolish creeds, obey the Scriptures, respect conscience, and no room will be left for churches, or individuals, to denounce their brethren as heretics, or to kindle discord by recrimination and offence.

But oppression and tyranny, contentions and broils, quarrels between churches, enmities between neighbours, coldness between friends, faction in states, tu-

mults in society, tranquillity disturbed, peace destroyed, and good faith violated, have not constituted all the bad effects of prescribed forms of belief. They have been the refuge of depravity, the cloak of artifice, the screen of hypocrisy, a veil of darkness, which has concealed many a purpose of blackest die, many a heart of foulest treachery. They have too often produced in the language of Jerom, *Concordia malorum major quam bonorum*, a greater harmony of wicked, than of good men. Who does not respect the garb of piety? Who will suffer the eye of suspicion to rest on the robes of formal sanctity? When a man talks much of his creed, and punctually observes the written forms of his church, does not all the world cry out, his faith is sound, all must be right? Here is the deception. Piety is so rare a grace, that we are apt to connect its essence with forms; and Confessions of faith are the most convenient and imposing forms imaginable. They cost nothing; they may be had for the wearing; and they afford an impenetrable covert for every species of fraud and iniquity.

Again, the habit of creed making has given rise to a dangerous fallacy respecting the *extent* of a true christian faith. Many seem to think a system of belief valuable and safe only in proportion to its length. The gradual enlargement of the standard Confessions has encouraged this notion. The most ancient creed, fabulously denominated the Apostles', contains a dozen lines; the Nicene, twice as much; the Athanasian, twice as much more; the Augsburg Confession contains twenty-eight chapters; the English, thirty-nine articles; the Scotch, thirty-three chapters. Thus have points of difference been multiplied. Every age has

added something, till finally the more copious the system of faith, the more secure the believer thinks himself.

It is no uncommon thing to find persons, who tremble at the thought of believing too little, but never dream of the peril of believing too much. And yet, which is the most dangerous? What is it to have a correct faith? Is it not to believe the exact truth? Is the hazard less on one side, than on the other?

It seems a matter of confidence and satisfaction to some, that, since they believe all that others believe, and much more, their chance of salvation is proportionably enhanced. What is this *much more?* If it be truth, it is important; but if it be error, it is a pernicious addition. The doctrines of the christian religion are facts; they are to be studied as facts, and understood as such. They rest on evidence and conviction, and to carry them beyond these, manifests weakness and credulity, rather than a teachable disposition, or a sound mind. When you search for historical facts, are you gratified, that the historian tells you a great deal more than ever happened? When you read a book of science, do you think it an advantage, that the writer has interwoven conjectures of his own with his demonstrations, and the results of his experiments? Why, then, should it be thought safe to adopt a principle in religion, which is the last, that would be admitted in the inquiries of common life, and which affords no means of distinguishing truth from falsehood?

In short, as credulity is a more common failing than distrust, there is a much greater proneness to multiply, than diminish the objects of faith. It is better, says *Cicero, to* think nothing, than to meditate evil. *Nil*

sentire est melius, quam prava sentire. We may say the same of belief. It is better to have no faith at all, than to believe what is false. Additions to truth are errors, and from these have chiefly arisen divisions and discords; not from any want of faith in the essential truths of the Gospel, but from a belief, or a pretended belief, in many things not contained there. The only remedy is to go back to the Scriptures, and start with the conviction, that the true christian faith consists in believing just enough and no more.

But one of the worst effects of this system of prescribing faith, and dictating to conscience, has been to encourage pride and a malignant temper. Slight divisions have grown up into a most violent rancour, which has increased in bitterness, till it has ended in a consummation of all that is wicked in the human heart, *the spirit of intolerance;* that spirit, whose breath is a pestilence, whose touch is death, and whose delights are scenes of darkness and iniquity; that spirit, which Christ censured in the haughty, persecuting Jews, and which incited these same Jews to demand his death, to mock at his sufferings, and revile him in his dying moments; that spirit, which led suffering martyrs to the stake and consigned them to the flames; which darkened, deluded, and tortured the world for ages, kindled the ferocious zeal of bigotry, forged the chains, and lighted up the faggots of persecution. Shall we say, that this spirit still lives? Does it not live in the hearts of those, who would reproach and disturb others for their opinions, and who are more zealous to show their regard for the faith, than for the essential virtues of the christian religion? Does it not live where misrepresentation and abuse usurp the place of christian love and

charity, and where hatred and malevolence blot out the kind affections? In some degree it dwells in the breast of every man, who would encroach on the religious liberty of another, and fix a stigma of reproach where he cannot fasten the chains of his creed.

How is it, that the emotions of pity, humanity, and tenderness, voluntarily rise up when we behold our fellow-men in trouble, or distress, or under any temporal calamity; but if they are suspected of being so unfortunate as to entertain a false opinion, or to swerve from what we are pleased to call the true faith, they are at once denounced and shunned as dangerous to society; the passions are inflamed; they are treated rudely; they are assaulted with the voice of menace and irritation; the milk of human kindness seems to be dried up from its source; the currents of benevolence and sympathy are frozen in their channels? Not a trace can be detected of that mild, and forbearing, and gentle, and affectionate spirit, which pervades the Gospel, and ought to reside in the breast of every christian.

Why should any persons desire to persecute others, or clamour against them, because they cannot in conscience subscribe to the same articles, nor bring their minds to receive the same opinions as themselves? Is any one injured by what others think? Certainly not. Why then be disturbed? Because, some have said, although we are not injured, God is dishonoured, and it is our duty to vindicate his honour, and support the cause of true religion.

Let such imitate God. Does he show resentment; does he inflict the punishment of his neglect and displeasure; does he pour out the vials of his wrath on *those especially*, who do not agree with them in opin-

ion? Are they scorched by his lightnings, or do his thunders burst on their heads alone? On the contrary, are not all equally the objects of his bounty and blessings, his paternal care and protecting providence? Shall we have the vanity and presumption to think, that we are vindicating the honour of God, by pursuing a course of action directly opposed to all his dealings with men, by violating his commands, and doing injury, where he confers unmeasured favours? If we would promote his glory, let it be our highest concern to obey and imitate him. In regard to our differences with our brethren, in which we all believe ourselves right, let us humbly ask, in the language of Paul, "Who maketh us to differ? What have we, that we did not receive?" God is the author of all; him alone are we to serve; him alone are we to please.

Thus have we briefly developed the principal causes of the evils, which the protestant church at large has suffered. The influence of the same causes may be followed into narrower circles, and be found no less destructive of religious truth, harmony, and practice. Churches there are, which profess to unite under one name, and which come together at stated times in the form of a Convocation, Convention, Association, or General Assembly. Each of these has a creed to regulate the faith of the whole body, and every member proffers a solemn declaration, that he will adhere to all its articles. But where is the Convention, or the Assembly, in which there is any thing like a unanimity of belief?

Take the English Church for an example. Have not every shade and gradation of sentiments, many of which are as opposite to each other as light to darkness,

been zealously and pertinaciously taught in that church, in defiance of the three Creeds and the thirty-nine Articles? Take the Presbyterian Church for another example. Is it not a notorious fact, that many in this enclosure are Hopkinsians and Arminians, and that a very small portion believe literally in all the dogmas of the Westminster Divines? No one will deny these facts. And is not the inference just, that imposing a formulary, which thus ensnares men's souls, is a source of incalculable injury to pure religion? It leads either to hypocrisy, to violations of a sacred agreement, or to downright excommunication, either of which justly brings a scandal on the christian profession.

The Congregationalists, and perhaps other sects, have another practice. Not content with the confessions, creeds, and platforms, bequeathed to them by their fathers, as pillars of support to the fabric of their faith, separate congregations have taken care doubly to fortify themselves by minor formularies, or covenants, to the fashion of which every member must be conformed. Into these choice symbols you will often find wrought all the mysteries of school divinity, ontology, pneumatology, and metaphysics, to which the most untutored mind in the parish must acknowledge his undoubting assent and consent, before he can be admitted to the privileges of a christian. Here you have the poison of this system extending to the minutest ramifications of society. You may behold its effects in the divisions of churches, lawsuits about church property, quarrels among neighbours, altercations among friends, and irreconcilable alienations supplanting good fellowship and kind feelings.

Let it be observed, however, that the mischief of creed-making does not arise simply from bringing together a set of articles, to which any one is ready to subscribe. Every man's faith is in some sense a creed, and in itself considered there is no more crime in writing it out, than there is in thinking it over in his mind. It is not writing it, nor arranging it into articles, nor endeavouring by fair argument to convince others of its truth, that clothes it with danger, and converts it into an instrument of disorganization and oppression. It would certainly be much better to be guided by Scripture language, and be satisfied with the words of divine wisdom, yet there can be no essential harm in telling the world what we believe in our own way, provided we are disposed to go no farther. But, unfortunately, no one is contented to stop here; nor have creeds ever been made for the purpose alone of expressing what their makers believed. They have invariably been designed to operate on the minds of others; they have been thrust forward as tests of a true faith; they have been imposed as conditions of christian fellowship. In this consists their mischief, in their usurpation, their encroachment on right, their assault on conscience, their exclusive, intolerant tendency.

Christ the Master of his Disciples.

Our Saviour often warned his disciples against the pride and vanity of the Scribes and Pharisees. They loved the homage of the multitude, set up pretences to superior sanctity, assumed titles of distinction and reverence, and claimed the privilege of controlling the

faith and consciences of the people. Their ears were delighted with the name of master, doctor, teacher, rabbi. They were expounders of the law, and as the law was a religious, civil, and political code, the influence which they acquired in this profession naturally raised them to a high ascendency, and put into their hands an undue weight of power. This pampered their pride, and they became sticklers for dignity, hypocritical, false, and overbearing.

In cautioning his disciples against the vices of the Scribes and Pharisees, our Saviour tells them on a certain occasion, "One is your Master, even Christ." This he would have them understand as a sufficient reason, why they ought not to submit in the concerns of religion to any other master, and why they should themselves refuse this title. It was their duty to be humble learners, rather than ostentatious teachers; and the spirit of their profession required, that they should not look on themselves as wiser or better than their brethren.

Let us attend to the general sense of the Saviour's injunction, and see in what respects he may still be said to be the master of his followers. It should here be premised, that *master* in the original means the same as *teacher*. It denotes a person, who has qualifications and authority to instruct, and who claims the respect and obedience of his disciples.*

* The word καθηγητης, which is translated *master*, literally means a *guide;* or, as Schleusner defines it, *dux viæ*. Instead of καθηγητης some manuscripts have διδασκαλος, *teacher*. According to Rosenmuller this reading is preferred by Grotius, Beza, *and Selden.*

In many things Christ did not profess to be the master, or teacher of mankind.

First, he gave no instructions in physical science; he revealed not the laws of nature; said nothing of the causes and operations of things; advanced no theories, built up no systems, invented no hypotheses.

Secondly, he made no improvements in the arts of life, nor suggested any means for ameliorating the physical condition of society.

Thirdly, he published no rules of civil government; he said nothing of the laws of nations, nor of the manner in which kingdoms or smaller communities might be governed with the greatest liberty, harmony, and happiness.

In none of these things was he a teacher. The reason is obvious. He came for a higher purpose; he came to teach men, not what they could find out themselves, but what the light of human wisdom could never detect. It is true, that all the above particulars are deeply interesting to mankind; they embrace the whole compass of human action and inquiry as pertaining to this life. To convert the works and laws of nature to our highest comfort, to multiply the useful arts of life, and to institute governments that shall preserve order and general happiness, are among the highest purposes of human thought and exertions. But it is equally true, that these are attainments in which we can advance by the strength of our own powers, and as fast, probably, as our condition will admit of permanent improvement.

And this very advancement, the gradual progress of intelligence in regard to the things around us, is unquestionably one of the highest sources of our enjoy-

ment. If we knew all things by revelation, we should have no room for the cultivation of our faculties; we should lose the pleasures, which we gather from inquiry; the spirit of enterprize would slumber; the charm of knowledge would be gone; the zest of life would sink into a monotonous insipidity. Action is happiness, pursuit is happiness; the man without deed or motive may well be set up as a monument of misery. Far from a blessing would it have been, if Christ had taught us all things in the purposes of nature and the arts of life.

Nearly the same may be said as to principles of government. No positive instructions could have been given, which would not result in more harm than good. Government is founded on mutual agreement; it is a compact of choice, and must in the nature of things take its character from circumstances of time and place. Laws must be adapted to the genius of the people for whom they are designed, to their condition, their habitudes of life, and modes of thinking. These are as various as the tribes of men, and the vicissitudes of climate. There can be no such thing as a standard of laws or government; and any instructions on these subjects, which should aim at a universal influence, would encumber, and not strengthen the means of safety and good order.

Hence we perceive the wisdom of leaving these subjects untouched, in a series of instructions designed for the benefit of the whole human race. And this wisdom will appear in a more exalted light, when we know, that all the truths taught by Christ, at the same time they have a bearing of infinite importance, are calculated and designed to aid our progress in knowledge

and refinement, conduct us to the best uses of physical nature, and qualify us for the highest enjoyments of social being. This we shall discover as we proceed to enumerate some of those things in which Christ is truly the master of his followers.

First, Christ is our teacher in all that can be known respecting a future life. From the foundation of the world, men have descended to the grave, and none has awaked from his slumbers to tell the awful secrets of his abode. The ebon veil of death has hung in gloomy silence, fixed as the pillars of nature; no human power has been able to draw it aside; nor has it been the lot of any human eye to catch a glimpse from the world of light, which rests beyond on the bosom of infinitude. Jesus has removed the veil, he has unsealed the darkened vision of mortals, and clothed the future with reality. In the solemn truth of a future existence and retribution, he is our great, our only teacher. From him alone we know, that we shall have a being in another world, when the lamp of life is extinguished in the present; that we shall exist and act, enjoy or suffer, in a state of never ending consciousness.

Secondly, Christ is our only master in teaching us the condition of future being, and acquainting us with the kind of preparation necessary for making it a home of happiness. He assures us, that this condition will depend on what we do in the present life; and here he proclaims the eternal distinction between good and evil. The righteous shall be happy, the wicked shall be miserable. In these two facts, that we shall live hereafter, and be happy or miserable according to the use

we make of our moral faculties, and in all the consequences flowing from them, Christ is our only master.

Thirdly, Christ is our teacher in the rules, which may fit us for the future. There is nothing speculative in his doctrines; they all have a bearing on the heart and life. He has published commands to be obeyed, motives to have an influence, precepts to be reduced to practice. He has taught us the perfections of the divine nature, the necessity and use of worship, the love of truth, righteousness, and peace. He has taught us to live together as brethren, to be kind and gentle, forbearing and compassionate; to let the light of piety and benevolence shine out and brighten our course in all the walks of life.

Fourthly, Christ is our teacher in the important duties of humility and repentance. He promises nothing to the haughty and impenitent. The mercy of God will flow into the heart of the humbled, penitent transgressor, and wash out the stains of his guilt, and restore him to the privileges of which his folly had rendered him unworthy; but the hardened, obstinate sinner shall not know peace, he shall not dwell in the abodes of safety, nor taste the joys, which spring out of the fountains of hope, and diffuse gladness throughout the sphere of existence. The doctrine of repentance is prominent in the instructions of Christ, and he encourages no one to look with confidence to the world of glory, who shall cast under his feet this vital precept.

Fifthly, we may sum up all by saying, that Christ is the teacher, or master, of his disciples in whatever pertains to the truths, motives, and purposes of religion. He has taught the religion of nature and of heaven, and *he is the only* master of those, who embrace this reli-

gion. By him is unfolded the scheme of redemption from iniquity, and restoration to divine favour. Through his instructions sinners may come to a knowledge of God and of duty, they may turn from evil, serve their Maker, and be made fit subjects for his kingdom. Christ has revealed the true religion. In all that concerns us as immortal beings, in all that relates to our hopes and fears, our prospects and destiny as moral and accountable agents, we have the highest reason to rejoice, that "one is our Master, even Christ."

It is a consideration demanding particular notice, that in religion we have no other, than this one master. If we profess his religion, it is a duty of paramount obligation to reject all other teachers, and adhere to the truth and plainness of his doctrines, as taught by him and recorded by his Apostles. It was the custom of the Jewish doctors, says Le Clerc, in remarking on the passage above quoted, to require assent from the people not only to things not contained in the law, but to dogmas directly opposed to it. They warped the faith of their unsuspecting followers to the bent of their own fancy and will; they invented articles and taught them till they were pretended to be sacred traditions, which demanded credence as truths from heaven.

Of the additions of such masters our Saviour admonishes his disciples to beware. The admonition is not without its weight at the present day. The world is full of masters, who would usurp the place of him to whom all owe allegiance. Each would give laws in his own way, turn the current of opinion in his own channel, and mould the faith and reason of men to his own pattern. Let no one lean on these broken reeds, by

yielding either to the delusions of enthusiasts, the domination of presumptuous assurance, the wily designs of hypocrisy, or the honest bigotry of ignorance and perverted sentiment. Let Christ be our only master in reality as well as in name, and the Gospel precepts our only guide in practice as well as in profession.

CLERICUS.

Spirit of Orthodoxy.

It is so long since we had occasion to introduce any remarks under this head, that we began to indulge the hope of being relieved from the unwelcome duty of pointing out the mistakes, and exposing the untoward spirit of our opponents. We have flattered ourselves, that they were gradually becoming better informed, that their knowledge and zeal were approximating the same point, and that the christian temper was diffusing a brighter influence over the mind, and kindling warmer charities in the heart. In some of these convictions we still rejoice to believe ourselves not disappointed.

There has been an obvious change in the mode adopted four years ago by the orthodox at the south in attacking unitarians. Violence has subsided; hard names are less frequent, and have given place to those of milder import; reason and consistency are not wholly disregarded; round, positive, unqualified assertions, without proof, are ventured with less temerity; respect for the honest opinions of others has grown more common; and the righteous influence of christian principles has spread by degrees to a wider extent. This *salutary change* we ascribe to the progress of know-

ledge; for our hearts always leaned to the side of charity, and we were ever willing to put to the account of ignorance many perversions, which bore too deeply on their front the marks of malevolence. But wherever we may look for the cause, we are glad to witness the result. We are glad to find our brethren uttering themselves in a gentler tone, breathing a purer spirit, and lighting up with more complacency the genial flame of peace and kindly feeling.

Providence, however, has not exempted us from the common lot of humanity; it has not permitted our delights to spring up without some unseemly, noxious weeds to retard their growth; it has not gathered around us the blossoms of joy without planting here and there the rude, repulsive thorn and thistle to temper the excesses of our pleasures; in short, it has not scattered the seeds of the christian spirit in every heart, although it has sown and fostered them successfully in some. We have now before us one testimony to these remarks, one proof, that the ways of providence are mysterious, and that in this imperfect state, good must always be alloyed with evil; one proof, that in the system of things it was intended, that our patience should be tried, and our expectations crossed.

Some of our readers will doubtless recollect, that, at the commencement of our labours, we were met in no very courteous manner by a work called the Presbyterian Magazine, which came before the world with the powerful recommendation of being upheld by the united wisdom and talents of twelve clergymen of Philadelphia. Bearing the burden of this accumulated patronage, it made its way for several months, but at length disappeared. A successor stepped in, which hangs out

the signal of the *Christian Advocate*, and, if we have been rightly informed, the burden, which the twelve laid down, has been taken up and is now sustained by a single hand.

This work has gone into the field against unitarians, and although it has certainly commenced the warfare with a more laudable moderation, than its predecessor, yet it shows more symptoms than could be desired of ill directed zeal, and submission to the decrees and court policy of the old regime. A few specimens will illustrate our meaning, and acquaint our readers with some of the controversial tactics of orthodoxy.

"The fact is," says the Christian Advocate, "the Bible itself is too *sectarian* for those *liberal* men, who would degrade the Son of God to a level with his own creatures; who extol the dignity of human nature in terms that contradict the plainest testimonies of the inspired writers; and who deem it too humiliating to accept of a salvation, purchased by blood divine, because it implies that man is a sinner, helpless and undone. Were it in their power, they would expunge all those passages from the Bible, that go to prove doctrines to which they feel so hostile. Hence their attempts to prove certain passages spurious. Hence many of their emendations, and forced interpretations. Every christian is too sectarian for these liberal teachers—who will not deny the Lord that bought him, who will not discard that offensive truth, the total depravity of human nature, and who will not disbelieve the necessity of being regenerated by the power of the Holy Ghost."

These charges are old, to be sure, but their antiquity renders them none the less false or harsh, none the less uncivil or unchristian. As far as we can recollect, however, it is the first time that unitarians have been charged with not considering man a sinner. But we wish to deprive no one of the merit of original discoveries. The hackneyed accusation of delighting in the work of expunging the Scriptures, and proving them

spurious, although it claims not the distinction of originality, has no foundation except in the meddling spirit of those by whom it is reiterated. It is a fact, which ought to be heeded by these gratuitous accusers, that every text in the Scriptures, which unitarians are said to pervert, has received from learned trinitarians the same sense, which they assign to it. We do not mean, that any one trinitarian has interpreted the whole Bible in the same sense as any one or more unitarians, but we do mean, and we assert it with confidence, that the mass of trinitarian expositors have given to the whole Scriptures, some to one part and some to another, the unitarian interpretation. Hence, you will rarely find a unitarian explaining any controverted passage according to his views of its meaning, without quoting a trinitarian critic of authority in confirmation of his opinion. To this fact we desire our accusers to attend, and, when they would tax their brethren with the crime of wilfully and wickedly perverting the Scriptures, we beg them to restrain their zeal within the wholesome enclosures of truth.

To admit the following extract into our pages, we are conscious would demand some apology, were we not writing in self defence. May the time never come when we can sanction vulgarity and irreverence in speaking of the Son of God. We assure our readers, that we take the following specimen from an article, the whole strain of which is not less unhallowed. It shall bear its own comment.

"Socinians have no alternative, but either to admit the equality of the Son with the Father, or to stab the moral character of the very core."

We were not a little surprised, that the Christian Advocate should bring up anew the *Abstract of Unitarian Belief*, which appeared in our first number, and especially with a view to point out its errors. If our memory be not more treacherous than it has usually been, the Presbyterian Magazine quoted nearly every passage in that article, wondering that we should be so simple as to set up such points of faith as any thing peculiar, and protesting that they were sound Presbyterian doctrines. If Presbyterianism has changed since that period, the enigma is solved; but if it has not, we must confess ourselves in the dark. One paragraph in the writer's strictures on our Abstract, we cannot deny our readers the edification of perusing. After having proved, with an ingenuity that might rival the logical acuteness of Aristotle or Peter Ramus, the *inconsistency* of unitarians, he is now discoursing on their indifference. He thus closes this topic.

"We think it quite possible, however, that part, at least, of that indifference to agreement in religious opinion, which *she* [unitarianism] manifests, is but a mere covert to suit *her* present circumstances, and is presented to popular prejudices as a screen, under which *she* may more successfully propagate *her* peculiar opinions."

In one thing here the ingenious author certainly again merits the praise of originality, and that is, in representing unitarianism under the similitude of a woman. This praise shall be his own. But in another point he seems to have wandered without his guides. The *indifference* of unitarians is not among the topics of the day. Our zeal has been lauded to the skies, and lamented as one of the calamities of this degenerate age; a passion for making proselytes has been drawn as one darkest features; and no motives have been chase away the drowsy apathy

of the orthodox, than the watchful, active spirit of unitarians. This argument has been used as a kind of magician's wand to open the purses of cautious wealth and prudent competency, to give a louder voice to the trumpet of declamation, and a keener edge to the sword of party. But we forbear to press this subject, for the present is not the only instance in which it needs no resort to a syllogism to prove, that consistency is not the most shining attribute of orthodoxy.

Again, we are told, that

"Unitarians seem cautious of presenting their doctrines fully to the light. Why they are thus timorous, I will not inquire. But such is obviously the fact. Hence we find them partially *concealing* those parts of their belief, which they consider less popular, or expressing them in ambiguous language."

The charge of *concealment*, like that of indifference, we had thought was too threadbare for use. The writer has surely been a dull observer of passing events. For his credit with his party, we deeply fear, that he has not drawn wisdom and knowledge from that copious fountain, which has shed such a flood of light on the dark purposes of unitarians. Can it be, that he has never admired the boldness, and pondered the veracious speculations, of a late martial champion of his cause? Has he not read of the wicked schemes of unitarians, and shuddered at intelligence like the following? "From the pulpit and the press, by the formal volume, the humble pamphlet, and every variety of exhibition, that ingenuity can devise, they are endeavouring to make an impression on the public mind. In every direction, and with a profusion of the most lavish kind, they are daily scattering abroad their instruments of seduction." Has he not read, and admired the beautiful allusion, that "these poisoned

agents so completely fill the air, that, like one of the plagues of Egypt, they noisomely 'come up into our houses, our chambers, and our kneading troughs?'" If he has not read these things, we hold him inexcusable; and if he has, he makes but a poor display of his wisdom, in talking of the indifference and concealment of unitarians.

Several pages of the Christian Advocate are devoted to an article on Mr. Belsham's Translation and Exposition of the Epistles of Paul, taken from the Eclectic Review It is commenced with a formal profession of fairness, moderation, and impartiality. But this profession proves to be little else than a disguise to the author's true purpose, which is to exhibit the sentiments of unitarians in as unfavourable a light as possible. He is temperate, and this is all the praise he deserves; he is neither fair nor impartial. He puts a colouring on Mr. Belsham's sentiments, which his work does not warrant, and helps him to criticisms, which he never would admit. With this article, however, we are not concerned, and shall only notice one or two remarks of the editor of the Christian Advocate.

"Mr. Belsham is in England the unitarian champion of the day. In the work here reviewed, we have his exposition of that part of the New Testament, which unitarians have been accustomed to say the least about, when not pressed to it by controversy; and which the orthodox consider as containing the most unequivocal evidence, that the socinian system is essentially false, unscriptural, and ruinous to the souls of men."

As for this allegation, it may indeed be said, that unitarians generally consider the words of the Saviour, as setting forth in a proper manner the important doctrines of christianity, yet they believe with equal confidence, that the Apostle Paul taught only truth from

heaven, and that his instructions afford a bright illustration of the Saviour's doctrines. To say that they avoid his Epistles, is to go with one stride to the antipodes of truth. On no part of the Scriptures do they more implicitly rely; on none do they dwell more, in explaining what they deem the great principles of christianity. With no sect have these Epistles more seriously engaged the attention of critics and commentators. This might be abundantly tested by reference to facts. Socinus, Crellius, Schlictingius, Walzogenius, and others of the Polish unitarians, expound at large the Epistles of Paul. Some of them wrote commentaries on the whole, as may be seen in the Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum. Priestley did the same, and so did Whitby, who corrected his early mistakes in his Last Thoughts. Locke wrote a paraphrase and notes on the Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, and Ephesians; Peirce on the Collossians, Philippians, and Hebrews; Benson on the Thessalonians, Timothy, Philemon, and Titus; Taylor on the Romans; Chandler on the Galatians and Ephesians; Goadby on all the Epistles; and many others, too numerous to be mentioned, on various parts. These were unitarians, and when we come to the plain truth, no class of christians have studied with more care, or explained more fully, the Epistles of Paul. Yet the learned editor of the Christian Advocate steps on the stage and tells us, that their delight consists in casting aside the writings of this Apostle, and holding no communion with him, except when driven by the orthodox into the perplexing trammels of controversy.

Extracts, such as we have selected, might be multiplied, but we spare our readers. The following

remarks, taken from *An Inquiry into the Comparative Moral Tendency of Trinitarian and Unitarian Doctrines*, have an appropriate connexion with the present subject.

"Charges of heresy, unbelief, denying the Saviour, and perverting the Scriptures, have been poured out upon unitarians, with a confidence and self sufficiency, that bear few marks of the humility inculcated in the Gospel. They have defended themselves, as God has given them strength, against the prejudices of sectarism, the asperity of intolerance, the pretensions of the self righteous, the subtleties of the ingenious, the arguments of the candid, and the sober objections of the sincere and well informed. They have claimed the privilege of obeying conscience, and of relying on the Scriptures for the truth of their opinions. Yet the same charges continue to be reiterated. When the arguments of unitarians cannot be confuted, the next step is to question their motives; when such opinions as they openly profess, are found impregnable, it is charitably insinuated, that others are concealed, which they dare not publish; when reason proves a feeble or treacherous ally, it is thought honourable to employ the pioneers of censure and reproach. Argument goes out supported by recrimination, and where one fails to produce conviction, the other may succeed to rivet a prejudice. But these are abuses of controversy, which must gradually disappear. The spirit of the times will not long tolerate them; liberty and reason will be heard, justice and truth will be respected."

In short, the time will come, when knowledge will go abroad in the earth, and then a better spirit will reign in the minds and hearts of men. Truth will be thought of higher import, than the watch word of party, brotherly kindness will stand before a traditionary faith, and the neglected virtue of a due self estimation, will be restored to its proper rank among the attributes of a christian. Every good man must be glad in such an anticipation, and join most heartily in the prayer of the pious Stoinski; *Prophetandi in ecclesia Domini aurea libertas integra unicuique maneat.* Let every one enjoy the golden liberty of faith and conscience in the church of the Lord.

Early Unitarians in Poland.

No full and impartial history of Unitarianism since its revival in Europe, about the time of the Reformation, has ever been written. The best, which has appeared, is a brief outline prefixed to Rees's Translation of the Racovian Catechism. Mosheim's chapter on this subject is meagre and faulty in the extreme, not so much from any apparent disposition to deceive, as from a want of interest in the inquiry, and a strong prejudice against the faith of unitarians. He takes his facts generally from the mouths of their enemies, and seems not to be over critical in examining the sources from which he draws.

A greater favour could not be conferred on the unitarian public, than a copious history of the progress of their faith during the last two hundred and fifty years, sketched by a faithful hand, and selected from authentic materials. Such a work would do much to illustrate the power of religious truth in dispelling prejudice, and fostering the growth of light and liberty in society and governments. The spread of rational and just principles in religion will always give life to the liberal arts, promote refinement of manners, the stability of good institutions, just habits of thinking, and salutary regulations to govern human conduct. Such has been the course of things, and the renovating, improving spirit of modern times is in reality the spirit of unitarianism, the spirit of reason, nature, and truth. It is no other, than the exercise of the great laws of heaven and right carried into the multiplied departments of human action. The history of this faith, therefore, is

not to be confined to a religious opinion, or to the fortunes of a sect; the influence of its principles are to be pursued; the power which these principles have exercised, and the effects which they have produced, are to be considered.

But we have no room to enlarge on this subject. We only design to bring to the notice of our readers a few interesting particulars respecting the expulsion of the unitarians from Poland. This we shall do in an abridged translation of an article prefixed to an edition of the works of Crellius, printed in the year 1656, and supposed to have been written by the editor of that edition.

After some brief remarks on the early part of Unitarianism, and the causes of its decline, he goes on to add, that when the deep shades of darkness, which for many ages overspread the world, had been in some degree scattered by the labours of Erasmus, Luther, Zuingle, and other Reformers, then the truths respecting the Saviour of men, his character, person, and office, began to be brought again to light.

These truths were first revived in Italy by Lælius Socinus of Sienna, and subsequently by his nephew Faustus, as appears in an account of his life and writings by a Polish nobleman.

Yet no just reason can be assigned for classing indiscriminately under the title of socinians, all those who recognize the leading tenets of the Italian reformer. Many confessors of this faith, as ecclesiastical history can testify, flourished between his age and that of the Apostles; and its most cautious adversaries, who stigmatize it with the name of heresy, as the Jews of old did the doctrine of the Apostles, are obliged to con-

fess, that it is not of modern origin, but renovated and restored to its ancient form. Nor, because many have refused to consider Socinus as a heretic, and a worthy object of reprobation and abhorrence, do they therefore hold his opinions to be necessary truths; nor pledge themselves, like slavish disciples, to support the dogmas of his school.

It justly excites our wonder, that those who, notwithstanding their belief in those doctrines which Zuingle and Calvin have lately introduced, reject with every mark of aversion the title of Zuinglians and Calvinists, should in their turn impose upon others the appellation of Socinians. And although these latter devoutly wish to be called by the name of their Lord and Master, Christ; yet, as those who glory in that name are distributed into various sects, which require to be designated by appropriate titles, they do not object in contradistinction to Trinitarians, to bear the denomination of Unitarian Christians, asserting as they do the absolute unity of person and essence in the Supreme Being, and the unity both in essence and person of Jesus Christ his Son; by which name, indeed, they are universally known in Transylvania and Hungary.

Not only in Poland, a country which gloried in its free constitution, did religious liberty prevail during the reign of Segismund the second, surnamed Augustus; but in Transylvania also, under his sister's son, Prince John Segismund, himself a member of the Unitarian communion, did the professors of this belief, in common with other dissenters from the church of Rome, enjoy unlimited toleration.

At first they frequented the same church with the evang elical Reformed, but when their peculiar tenets

became the subject of discussion, many of that party, actuated by an intemperate zeal, denounced and treated them as heretics. Upon this, and at the instance and under the conduct of the lecturer, Gregory, they began to hold separate assemblies in Cracow, the ancient capital of Poland. In like manner the Apostle withdrew his disciples from the Jewish Synagogue at Ephesus, because, by the opposition there made to his preaching, reproach was cast on the Christian profession.

Unitarian churches were also distributed throughout Poland, Lithuania, and their dependent provinces; in the royal cities, as Cracow, Lublin, and Novogorod; in the towns of the nobles, and in the numerous villages. They enjoyed nearly a whole century the peaceful exercise of their religion, with hardly a single instance of molestation. But it has never been the fortune of the true followers of Christ to possess on the earth a continuing city; nay, all who resolve to live piously in Jesus Christ have suffered, and will suffer persecution.

At an early period our adversaries regarded with fear and displeasure the defection of many Catholics and Protestants to the unitarian cause; and especially did they regard with suspicion our yearly synods convened at Racow, a town of Poland, and the expositions of our faith, which proceeded from the press at that place, and were disseminated through the neighbouring countries. It was a source of anxiety also, that, owing to the high reputation of our college at Racow, many youth among the Romanists were sent thither to be educated.

For these reasons, and stimulated by the bitterest envy, they resolved to destroy the fountain of these unwelcome innovations. An occasion, which at length presented itself, was eagerly seized. Some of the young men of the institution, during an excursion into the country, wantonly broke in pieces a wooden cross, which was planted near the highway. In consequence of this act, it was decreed at the diet of Warsaw, 1638, that the school at Racow should be interdicted, its church closed, its ministers and teachers driven into banishment, and its printing press destroyed. Not content with a rigorous execution of this sentence, they procured a similar decree of the tribunal of Lublin against the Racovian professors and divines, who had taken refuge in Kiselin and Beresco, towns of Volinia. And, to pass over less flagrant acts of outrage, Jonas Slichtingius was banished by the diet of 1647, for the publication of his *Christian Confession according to the Articles of the Apostles' Creed*, and the book itself, although it was taken almost literally from the Scriptures, was burnt as blasphemous by the common executioner.*

* The affair at Racow is thus detailed in Rees's Historical Introduction. "In the year 1638, some students belonging to the college of Racow, with imprudent and childish zeal, beat down with stones a cross which had been placed near one of the entrances into the town. This was construed by the Catholics into a designed insult of their religion, and an act of impiety of the blackest description. Notwithstanding the parents of the youths, and the heads of the colleges, punished the offenders, and publicly apologized for their conduct, offering, at the same time, to make any further atonement which the case could justly require or admit;—nothing could allay the fury of the people, who were led on and exasperated by their religious superiors. The cause was carried before the Diet at Warsaw in the course of the year, and was regarded with deep interest by all the

And after all this, as religious exercises were never suspended, although worshippers assembled in smaller bodies, it was resolved to devise some mode of exterminating the members of this communion. Accordingly, when the Swedes invaded Poland, and seized upon most of its strong holds; when many of the provinces tendered allegiance to the conqueror, and armies with their leaders revolted to his standard; because some unitarians claimed his protection, though few espoused his cause, no sooner had the Swedes evacuated the kingdom, than the people called Arians were banished by a public decree, not under a pretext of treason, lest the Swedes should resent their violation of that amnesty, which they had secured by treaty to their adherents, but avowedly because they denied the eternal godhead of Christ, and that, by the expulsion of such blasphemers, Poland might be again restored to the divine favour. All who remained within the realm were made liable to capital punishment, their goods were confiscated, and it was provided, that whoever should render any assistance to the exiles, should be obnoxious to the same penalties.

By this edict they were dispersed in foreign countries, but chiefly in those adjacent to Poland. Thus, in the midst of afflictions, designed as well for their chastisement, as for their trial and purification, did

distinguished persons there assembled. Eminent individuals of all communions,—of the Greek Church, of the Reformers, and even of the Catholic body itself,—interposed their influence to quash the proceedings, but all without success. For a decree was passed, enjoining that the Unitarian church at Racow should be closed, the college broken up, the printing-house demolished, and the ministers and professors branded as infamous, proscribed, and banished the state." *p. 34.*

the providence of God remove them from a land now become the theatre of hostile invasion and civil wars, where liberty soon gave place to licentiousness, and licentiousness to servitude.

Yet, notwithstanding the lights of the Church were thus removed from their stations, it pleased God to recommend the faith for which they suffered to the friends of truth and piety in other regions, so that numbers were every where found, who embraced its leading doctrines.

It is incumbent, therefore, on all who are lovers of the truth according to godliness, and not the slaves of popular prejudice, to examine with impartiality the merits of these writings, [the works of Crellius] lest they incur the guilt of condemning what they do not understand; and, also, inquiring rather what is said, than by whom it is said, to comply with the apostolical precept of proving all things, and holding fast that which is good.

Obituary of the Hon. George Cabot.

The good man is followed to the tomb by the regrets of the good, and his memory is engraved most lastingly on the hearts of those who loved him; wife, child, and friend, know best how to honour him, and need no other panegyric on his virtues, than that which their own eloquent recollections continually repeat to them. But if talents are united to his excellence, and his name had been a frequent and an honoured sound on the lips of his fellow citizens, some further notice seems to be

demanded; his character belongs to the public; and his example is to be preserved among those, which should be held up perpetually for reverence and imitation.

The subject of the following notice was such a man. To say that in private life he was respected and beloved, would be to use words too weak to express the sentiments, with which he was regarded by those, who were most intimately connected with him; and with respect to his public services, he performed no unimportant part during some of the most critical periods of our republic, both in the national councils, and in those of his native state.

George Cabot was born in Salem, Massachusetts, in the year 1751. After receiving the usual elementary instruction, he entered the university at Cambridge. He did not, however, remain there long, but soon went out into the more active scenes of life, and engaged in the fatigues and competitions of commerce. At the early age of eighteen he became master of a vessel, and in that capacity visited various parts of Europe. He did not visit them, however, as a mere man of business would. He carried with him a mind that watched and received; he looked with an observing eye on the manners and institutions of men, and on the wonders of nature and providence; he listened to every voice that brought instruction, and gathered up knowledge in the crowded city, and on the pathless sea.

At the age of twenty-five, he was a member of the Provincial Congress, which held its sittings at Concord, and had much influence in preventing some measures, which were repugnant to the soundest principles of political economy.

He assisted in framing the Constitution of Massachusetts, in the year 1780.

In the Convention of that state, which assembled at Boston, in 1788, to consult on the question of adopting the Federal Constitution, he was also active and useful, and, together with such men as Ames and Parsons, laboured with success to accomplish the happy result of its deliberations.

Not long afterwards, he was elected senator to Congress, and with reluctance accepted the appointment; for he never courted distinctions—they solicited *him.* While in this situation, he was confided in by Washington, and became the intimate friend of Hamilton. He did not remain in the Senate through the whole term for which he was chosen, but resigned his seat at the expiration of the fifth year of his service.

The rest of his life was principally spent in Boston, where, though he shunned all office and place, his advice was constantly sought, his opinion was universally respected, and his influence was, no doubt, as great and as salutary, as if he had consented to fill those stations of honour, to which the people would gladly have called him.

In the year 1814, however, he felt himself once more obliged to appear in public life. He was sent to the much talked of Convention, which assembled in Hartford, just before the close of our late war with England, and was chosen its President. The writer of this notice is fully aware of the nature of the sentiments, with which that Convention is generally regarded, and knows that its unpopularity is, at present, extreme. It would be altogether useless for him to express either his dissent from the public opinion, or

his approbation of it; but whatever may be thought of the policy of that assembly, he is sure, that a man of Mr Cabot's age, sense, and principles, would never have countenanced it with his presence, except after mature reflection, and with the best motives and views. He believes he may safely say the same of every other member.

Nothing but the strongest sense of duty induced Mr. Cabot to relinquish the calm walks of private life. He did not leave them again. He felt the infirmities of age coming fast upon him. For a long time before his death, he was subject to the attacks of an excruciating disorder, and he bore them with firmness and submission, as a Christian and a man. On the eighteenth of April, of the present year, and in the seventy-second year of his age, he resigned his spirit to God who gave it. It will not be soon that his loss will be repaired to the city where he lived; to his family and friends his place can never be filled.

No one could converse with Mr. Cabot an hour, without being struck with the correctness of his sentiments, the liberality of his opinions, the fitness of his illustrations, and the propriety and beauty of the language with which his thoughts were clothed. No one could see him, indeed, and mark the proportions of his form, the dignity and grace of his demeanour, and the expression of his manly and intelligent countenance, without being convinced that he was no common man.

But they who saw him often, and knew him intimately, could best estimate the resources of his mind, and the high worth of his character. He had always something new to communicate for delight and instruction; and they who conversed with him every

week and day, had never occasion to complain, that his stock of thoughts was exhausted, or that there was nothing more to be learned from him. By those who had any claim on his time, his advice was asked in doubtful cases, almost as a matter of course; and it was not asked in vain. With readiness and precision, but without the too common airs of dogmatism, patronage and superiority, the advice was given; and it was seldom that he who came for it went away dissatisfied, or that the counsel proved unsound. His aid was anxiously sought in all references; and many a dispute has been decided by the weight of his opinion, which would else have become a subject of expensive and tedious litigation. His well stored experience, and the natural acuteness of his intellect, rendered him highly worthy of this confidence. He had observed closely and accurately the tendencies and results of passing events, and he looked with penetration into the bosoms of men.

Integrity, firm principle, and a high sense of true honour, were the habits of Mr. Cabot's soul. It was no more to be suspected, that any temptation could prevail on him to swerve, even in thought, from the direct path of uprightness, than that a being would act in opposition to its nature. And therefore it was, that there were no bounds to the confidence reposed in him by his friends; they knew that every trust was sacred with him.

His sympathy with the feelings, and delicate attention to the opinions of others, were truly remarkable in one, whose own feelings and opinions were of so high and decided a character. But his benevolence was equal to his genius and good sense, and he could not

bear, that the weakest of his brethren should be unnecessarily offended. He always wished to conciliate, and, where principle did not come in question, to concede. Without prejudice himself, he gave a patient hearing, and paid a gentle deference, to the innocent prejudices of his neighbour; and in this manner secured the love, as well as the reverence, of all ranks, parties, and sects.

To his other excellencies was united a singular and genuine modesty. He knew too well what was real greatness in the human character, to be vain; and was too sensible of men's mutual dependence, and of the dependence of all men upon God, to be proud. He repelled no one by haughtiness, offended no one by presumption, disgusted no one by arrogance. He carefully avoided making himself the subject of conversation;—more carefully indeed than his friends would have desired; for perhaps there never was a man, who had seen and attained so much, who talked less of where he had been, what he knew, and what he had done.

In short, there was in Mr. Cabot's character a rare union of those qualities, which constitute true goodness, and raise man to the high dignity, of which his nature is susceptible. To borrow a passage from the eloquent sermon, preached on the Sunday after his interment, by President Kirkland, it may be said with confidence, that "the enumeration of the principal virtues, considered in their relation to ourselves, our fellow men, and the Deity, is a delineation of the character of our venerated friend. He was distinguished by prudence, which seeks lawful advantages by right and appropriate means; by contentment, which acquiesces in a moderate portion of good, is reasonable in wishes and

expectation, and keeps at a distance from selfish repining, though not without keen sensibility, and a constitutional predisposition to anxiety; by fortitude, a spirit collected and resolute in difficulties and dangers, and evincing always an entire superiority to fear; by patience, bearing trials with an equal mind, and especially showing exemplary composure in bodily sufferings; and by modesty, refusing to make pretensions, and display superiority; whilst estimating highly the value of opinion, paying a delicate respect to the impressions of other minds, and pleased with the favourable judgment of his fellow men. He exhibited the spirit of application and industry, executing seasonably and thoroughly what he undertook; and, though less willing than was desired to assume responsible employments, he was far removed from any thing like indolence. He maintained a wise and careful self-government, disdaining the bondage of sense; in pleasures, regarding the boundaries prescribed by nature, by health, and by duty. He saw the value of the golden mean in conduct, and cultivated the moderation which prevents virtue from degenerating into vice by irregularity and excess, and which, in relation to distinction and place, rather avoids than courts preeminence."

Mr. Cabot's religious views, principles, and feelings, were in perfect harmony with the whole of his character. A deep sense of his relation to God was the foundation of his virtue. A firm belief in the divine authority of the Christian revelation was the result of a full and candid examination of its evidences; and, though he punctually attended on all its ordinances, and was never backward to profess and maintain his convictions of its truth and its excellence, his Chris-

tianity was yet more in his heart than it was on his lips, and was to be seen in the conduct of every hour, and in all his usual occupations, as conspicuously as on the first day of the week, and in the temple of God. His ideas of the nature and attributes of the Supreme Being, and of the character and demands of religion, were eminently rational and liberal. He believed that God was infinitely merciful, compassionate, and kind; and that love, and not terror, was the prevailing language of religion. There was neither cant nor levity in his conversation, superstition in his thoughts, uncharitableness in his feelings, nor censoriousness in his judgments. He could not conceive of any other end in religion, than to make men virtuous, and consequently happy. If his neighbour was a good man, he took him by the hand, and inquired not too curiously into his faith; if he was a bad one, he was made no better in his eyes by any similarity of communion. His own creed was strictly unitarian; but two of its principal articles were universal charity, and unlimited toleration. He believed in one God, in one person; that Jesus Christ was his messenger and son; that men were to work out their own salvation; and that they would be accepted, not on account of what another had suffered, but, through divine mercy, for what they themselves had done. He had no faith in the utter vileness of human nature; and thought, that whatever pretended sanctity, or mere outside morality might be, true righteousness was infinitely better than filthy rags. He was no sectarian, nor maker of proselytes; but he was desirous of the advancement of liberal Christianity because he was firmly convinced that it would best promote the happiness of men. His opinions were not to

be shaken by the usual arguments, or cavils, for they were formed by impartial and mature investigation; and he was better acquainted with theology, than many are who pretend to teach it. The faith, which he had deliberately adopted in the strength of his days, remained to comfort his age, to cheer him in illness, and support him in the hour of death.

The writer knows that these are terms of high eulogium, but he is not sensible that one word is undeserved. For the last years of Mr. Cabot's life, he was honoured with his personal friendship; and he is well acquainted with the public sentiment regarding him. That sentiment will bear concurrent testimony with his own most vivid impressions; for, while the subject of this notice lived, he was spoken of with but one voice of esteem and veneration, as he is now with but one of regret and mourning.

Influence of a Knowledge of God.

Among the means of piety and goodness, none is more valuable than a knowledge of God; not merely a knowledge of his existence, but of his nature, attributes, dispensations, and providence. Do we know God to have infinite *power?* It should teach us that we are entirely at his disposal, that our strength is weakness, and our boldest efforts of no account in his sight. His *justice* should encourage us to perseverance, and patient submission under the trials and pains of life, assured that no good design will go unrewarded. God *knows* all things. And shall it be no restraint over our vices, that we are watched by so pure an eye,

whose vision no darkness can obscure, whose penetrating glance no swiftness can elude? God is *good*, infinitely good. Where is our gratitude? Where are the generous emotions, which should rise up to swell the notes of praise to a benefactor so unbounded in the riches of his benevolence and grace? God is *merciful;* not to the wicked, the obstinate, and the rebellious; but to the humble, the penitent, the virtuous. Who will delay to become the object of this mercy by reforming his life, and seeking the divine favour?

Let none entertain the degrading thought, that with God's mercy can be joined any evil passion. He cannot hate his creatures; he can only love them. The wicked have not to apprehend the hatred, the vengeance of God. Not a single attribute of his nature have they to fear. Their own follies, their wickedness, their perverseness, their disobedience, are the only objects at which they need be alarmed. These God will punish, but as much in mercy as justice; he would have all his creatures happy; he would purify them from the crimes, which are at war with their well being. Let all persons know God as he is, and they will serve him acceptably.

Unitarian Society at Pittsburgh.

A NEW building for public worship has been commenced by the unitarian congregation at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. This Society has for some time past been under the pastoral care of the Rev. John Campell, to whose work on the Unity of God and the Reconciliation made by Jesus Christ, we have on a former occasion *called the* attention of our readers.

THE

UNITARIAN MISCELLANY

AND

CHRISTIAN MONITOR.

No. XXXV.] NOVEMBER, 1823 [Vol V.

State of the Dutch Church.

To the Editor,

SIR,

IN your article on the Prospects of Unitarianism, in the Miscellany for July last, you have made mention of "four prominent places, where orthodoxy, since the era of the Reformation, was planted with a strength and deepness, which mere human foresight would predict could never suffer it to be eradicated, but where the result has utterly baffled such prediction." That part of Europe, generally denominated Holland, once considered as the bulwark of the reformed religion, and the strong hold of what is called orthodoxy, and where it has been defended in numerous ponderous volumes, with perhaps unequalled learning and perseverance, you have not named; but it offers at this moment another proof of the truth of your observation, that in all those places where Christianity has been partially or wholly released from her alliance with power, and the religious principle and the spirit of inquiry have together been allowed to exert their ener-

gies, more liberal views of religion have been introduced.

Notwithstanding the great name acquired by the protestant church in Holland, its situation soon after the introduction of the reformation had become truly deplorable; the spirit of protestantism, a spirit of freedom, without which it is lifeless, had fled; and the understanding, even among many of the learned, had become darkened by the disputes about those doctrines, which baffled the human intellect, and contradicted the plain doctrines of the Bible.

The study of Hebrew and Grecian literature was neglected for the explanation of the writings of the first reformers; and these, and not the Bible, were explained, and their doctrines enforced. Except Drusius, Episcopius, and Grotius, none thought it of importance to study critically the sacred writings; it was only required to adhere to what were called the points in dispute; and little interest was taken in the other points of faith and practice. Scholastic philosophy was recalled; the darkness of the middle ages returned; and at the examination of candidates for the ministry, nothing was so much inquired into, as their ability to defend the five contested points.

Towards the middle of that century, the Hebrew and Greek literature was more cultivated, but only to make it subservient to the prevailing system of divinity. Some better expositors appeared, but in the spirit of the Synod of Dort, and of that translation of the Bible, which had been entrusted by the government to the members of the Synod, *after the composition of their creed.* They either kept to the letter of this translation, or had recourse to a hidden and mystic sense,

after the philosophy of Aristotle, under which the plain truths of the Christian religion disappeared. No preacher dared to inculcate from the pulpit the practical morality of the Gospel, for fear of being accused as *a preacher of works.*

To explain how this could take place in a country, where the majority of the inhabitants had lately abjured the Church of Rome, and claimed the rights of conscience, and had been taught that the Bible alone was the creed of protestants, it is necessary to bring into view the situation in which that country was then placed.

Of the seventeen provinces which had revolted against Spain, ten had been forced to submit again to its bloody tyranny. The seven remaining in arms were composed of a population of about two millions, whereof a fourth part remained attached to their old faith. It was no wonder then that the reformers adopted the opinions of Calvin, as being the most opposed to those of the Roman church. The breach between the parties was thus made as wide as possible. Perhaps too it was thought advisable to present the multitude, educated in the mysteries of the Catholic religion, with the unintelligible and puzzling doctrines of Calvin. The reformed clergy succeeded to the unbounded influence of the discarded priests and monks, who were more abhorred for their adherence to the sanguinary and faithless government of Spain, than for their system of religion. A parallel is to be found between the revolt of the Spanish Netherlands, and that of the now United States of America; as both, in the outset, appealed to arms, to defend and preserve the civil rights which they enjoyed, on the ground of

charters and privileges. The encroachments on these rights in the Netherlands increased the attachment of the people to the reformed religion. The government of the Seven Provinces was engaged in an unequal and seemingly desperate contest with the then powerful monarchy of Spain; and it was chiefly by the influence of religious opinions and antipathies, that the nation could be brought to persevere in a protracted struggle for seventy years, attended with unparalleled sufferings and calamities. An alliance between church and state was the necessary consequence of this state of things.

By the historical records of those times, it appears, that more enlightened views with regard to the new doctrines of the reformation were entertained by many; and the zeal, bitterness, and learning, employed to defend the Calvinistic system proves also, that the number of those who dissented from it was not small, nor devoid of intelligence and learning. But the creed of the majority being formed, was strenuously defended against all further innovations, by the men who wielded its power over the nation and the government. The religious dissensions had, however, become so high and serious, that the convention of a National Synod was resolved on. Although the sovereign power was vested in the Assembly of the States General. Prince Maurice of Orange, the first captain of that age, on whom the safety of the new republic was considered to depend, exercised a great influence; and he meditated to put himself in the place of the renounced sovereign. Among the illustrious men who opposed him in this project, were *conspicuous* Oldenbarneveld, Grotius, and Hogerberts,

avowed Anticalvinists; and therefore it is no wonder that the influence of the Prince was exerted for the triumph of the Calvinistic creed, at the famous *Synod of Dort.* It was then that the national religion was established by law, and the church became more than before a power in the state. The Protestants in Holland were obliged to suffer the Synod of Dort, in imitation of the Councils of Nice, Constantinople, and Trent, and later Convocations, Parliaments, and General Assemblies, to make a creed for them, to be implicitly believed in, as it was, according to the declaration of that Synod, *the only true and divinely revealed doctrine* of the Bible.

This unwarrantable interference with the religious belief of a people, who so lately had rejected all human authority in matters of religion, and who might be considered sufficiently able to understand the duties, hopes, and expectations, presented to them in the Gospel, in the very words of the acknowledged author of the Christian faith, is not to be wondered at. Sectarian zeal directed the clergy; the people had been accustomed to clerical dominion; and at the birth of the reformation, the right and ability to explain the Christian doctrine had been claimed and exercised by the leading authors in that glorious work against the Roman clergy, and soon afterwards against their own disciples, whose minds had become distracted and unsettled by the disputes and differences between those very reformers.

That this national creed was not introduced till after sufficient and free deliberation, and encountered, so far as was permitted, with strong opposition, is evident from the history of that Synod; and that it was sub-

mitted to may be accounted for, when we reflect, that in all ages the *fides Carbonaria* is, and of necessity must be, the faith of the multitude, as long as it continues to believe in the contradiction, that even a divine revelation to men is a compound of mysterious doctrines, beyond their conception and intelligence. When once convinced of this, by the men whose interest it is to make them believe it, they are prepared willingly to accept from wiser heads a set of articles of belief, composed of mysteries and contradictions, and soon after to consider them as the result of their own convictions, especially when ignorance and presumption can thereby pride themselves in believing, and boast of understanding, what to unbelieving and carnal minds is, and must remain, unintelligible. This delusion accounts sufficiently for blind attachment to any system, honoured and distinguished by the name of orthodox; and we could not but admire the wisdom of the defender of the orthodox system of Princeton against another orthodox system of Andover, when he lately warned his brother Professor at the latter place, though no longer in terms of reproach and as the preacher of *another Gospel*, but, impressed by the sense of a common danger, in the most affectionate language, and with many flattering appellations, to beware of making his orthodox system somewhat more rational, and thereby endangering the fall of both orthodoxies to the ground. Superiority in candour and learning is on the side of Andover, but he of Princeton is undoubtedly wiser in his generation.

The Synod of Dort, once legally constituted, became a perpetual institution, with subdivisions into classes through the extent of the Republic, in order the better

to watch over the preservation of the only true faith; and in the unavoidable spirit of all such assemblies, it became a persecuting power. It was at the repeated, and not always respectful instances of those synods and classes, that the dissenting ministers, denominated *Remonstrants*, were not only deprived of their churches, and silenced, but banished from the country, like so many incorrigible and dangerous criminals. Emboldened by their first success against the Remonstrants, they ventured to engage the government in the persecution of the peaceable Roman Catholics, and to dictate in matters of state, by protesting, and even preaching against the system of toleration; but after the republic was acknowledged as a free and independent state, and the government had acquired strength, a curb was put on their insolence by the appointment of a Commissary, a member of the States General, to a seat in these assemblies, with the power of dissolving them, as soon as an attempt should be made to meddle with the temporal affairs of the country; leaving them at full liberty to explain, to strengthen, and to improve the articles of their creed, and to perfect this infallible standard of their faith. From that time, however, till the revolution in 1795, no person was admitted as a member of the government, or to any civil office, even in the distant colonies, or as a professor in the universities, or a teacher in the public schools, who did not profess to be a member of the church as by law established. The gradual decay of these once famous universities, may, in a great measure, be attributed to the system of proscription.

But in 1795, the church so long and so firmly established, fell with the state; and in 1817, when, the

country being restored to its independence, the present government convoked an assembly of the most eminent divines and professors in divinity, it was seen that even the clergy had till then submitted with reluctance to have their religious belief and instruction shackled by the articles of a creed, which caused their churches to be deserted by the enlightened part of the nation, and which had been there, as every where, either the cause of indifference, if not of infidelity in matters of religion, or of hypocrisy, animosity, and religious pride.

This assembly has acted with wisdom and moderation, in leaving untouched the whole fabric of the Canons of Dort, while, on the other hand, it has allowed to candidates for the ministry the liberty of believing and teaching them, IN AS FAR AS THEY ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BIBLE. Here is no violent reaction, no humiliating reflection cast on the former defenders of the system, no forcing of opinions, no new dominion exercised over the consciences of men, no pretensions to infallibility; and this prudent, laudable and Christian conduct, presents a striking contrast to that of the Synod of Dort. The Canons of that Synod are in future to stand on their own merit, or to fall by a more enlightened and free examination of the Scriptures. They may still be preached and enforced, and will find adherents; as they offer to the profligate and the vicious an easy refuge, when a late fear of an hereafter begins to assail them, and they are brought to believe by a heated imagination, worked on by fear, and a partial derangement of intellect, that having *cast their sins on Christ*, they are in a state of grace, and in no danger of falling from it; that their election is thereby

made sure, and that being numbered among the elect, and the saints who are to judge the world, they are to pronounce sentence of condemnation on all who have disbelieved their creed. So long as pride and presumption can be made to agree with unbounded protestations of humility and extravagant self-condemnation, Calvinism will stand on this wonderful and strange delusion, as on its surest basis.

Already has the tone of preaching, and numerous printed sermons, evinced how far ministers and people in Holland, had, before their emancipation from the national creed, been prepared for the promulgation and reception of more rational and scriptural doctrines. It appears from the monthly Reviews, that numerous volumes have been published in defence, and in the spirit of a purer Christianity, and that the ability and learning are chiefly on that side. The universities are regaining their ancient reputation and lustre, since the professorships are no longer confined to an exclusive sect of Christians.

The first translation of the Bible in the vernacular language, by the fathers of Dort, and other theologians of their party, was approved and introduced by the government in 1637. It was to be exclusively used in the churches, the universities, colleges, and schools; but the text of the scriptures was not left to explain itself, and copious marginal notes and other explanations were added, in accordance with the adopted creed. It was not till the latter part of the next century, that unauthorised translations of detached parts were published; and in 1791, a new and improved translation of the whole Bible was made by a professor of divinity, already favourably known

as the author of a learned and popular defence of the Bible. This translation, however faithful as to the sense, was considered not sufficiently literal. Another translation is now far advanced, by the celebrated Professor Vander Palm, who ranks high among the oriental scholars on the continent of Europe, and whose translation, it cannot be expected, will in the least be influenced by sectarian prejudices. For obvious reasons, the former dominant clergy, whose power was already on the decline in 1791, and lost in 1795, would have opposed and decried these translations. Now they meet with universal approbation, and the number of subscribers to that by Vander Palm amounts to more than two thousand; such is the confidence in the learning and honesty of the translator.

With regard to the doctrine of the trinity, you will judge what opinions are entertained, by the following concluding remarks, taken out of a volume of a highly accredited Review of the last year.

"The friend to Christianity and truth, recognises with heartfelt gratitude, that the prayer, *be it peace and truth in our days*, is more and more heard. With much zeal, which excludes all indifference about the Gospel, much toleration also is practised, and truth is not thereby sacrificed, but exercised in love. We remember with pain, how the disputes among Christians formerly divided different denominations, and even members of the same church.

"Since Heringa* was accused of heresy, on account of his sentiments on this dogma, and gained an honourable triumph, the disputes about it have not only ceased, but he still lives to enjoy the fruits of his labour, and

* A Professor of divinity, of great learning, and exemplary piety.

to see, that the words of human wisdom, not taken from holy writ, have become more and more distasteful to the ear of Christians.

"We believe, and know by experience, that the minister, who keeps himself strictly to the letter of the Bible, is heard with satisfaction, and is no longer censured. We have but one God the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ, who existed in glory before the world was, the perfect image, the only Son of God, whom to honour is to honour the Father. The Holy Spirit is the spirit of God himself, by which He who placed Jesus Christ at his right hand, in recompence of his humiliation, works all in all. Or do we know more about it? Can we know more about it? Is it necessary we should? May we attempt to do it? What do we know about ourselves? Do not our eyes, our hands, and our feet, meet every where with wonders, which by the investigation of *how* they exist, force us to exclaim, God is great! and we, human beings of yesterday, comprehend him not.

"The time will come when we may expect to comprehend him better; but through all eternity we shall not be able to comprehend the Infinite God. And now we ask once more, why was this question about the Trinity agitated anew in our days? Farther than what the Bible plainly and unequivocally teaches with regard to the only and true God, we can advance not a step, and none should attempt it, regardless of the peace of mind of sincere Christians, and the harmony of the church.

"It becomes us, with all humility, to say with an apostle, 'no one knows what is of God, but the Spirit of God.' This revealed truth is well expressed in an

answer to the question, once proposed by the French Academy; *qu'est ce que Dieu?* in the following lines;

'Loin de rien dire ici de cet Etre suprême,
Gardons en l'adorant, un silence profond,
Le mystère est immense, et l'esprit s'y confond;
Pour dire ce qu'il est, il faut être Dieu même.'"

It appears by the few extracts given from the book, that the author denies the doctrine of the trinity. He asserts that the Son and Holy Spirit do not belong to the divine essence, but that they are divine persons, as being the first creatures endowed by God with the most glorious attributes.

According to the reviewers, the author displays great learning, acuteness, and intelligence. They declare, however, that they do not agree with him in his view of the subject, and add, "Far be it, however, from any one to think disadvantageously of the author's heart. Let every one be convinced in his own mind. We call, with all our heart, the author, and every one else, our brother, who respects and is humble towards the Lord Jesus; who acknowledges him, loves and obeys him; who trusts in him, and adheres to him; and who warns others, who do not do this, that they will one day stand before his judgment seat."

Every believer in the Christian revelation, will observe with pleasure and thankfulness, that such sentiments are now openly avowed and approved, in a country, where, not many years ago, though they might have been felt, it was not thought advisable nor prudent to publish them. And every well wisher to this country must wish to see such feelings cherished here. But this cannot be hoped for, when we have even lately seen, that two professors, belonging to institutions each orthodox in its way, have disturbed

the plain Christians of their denominations, by disputes about the pre-existence of Christ, with arguments borrowed from the writings of early European authors on this subject, imported into this country because they are falling into oblivion there, and have presumed to talk and draw conclusions on the *essence* and *nature* of the incomprehensible Divinity. Such attempts to find out God by searching, to find out the Almighty unto perfection, we may call extreme presumption, perhaps by a harder name, but there is worldly wisdom in it. Those who build altar against altar in the Christian church, must be (let us hope unknown to themselves,) actuated by sectarian pride, self-interest, and the ambition to increase the numbers of their followers, by which their own consequence and lust of dominion is advanced. Doctrines not understood by themselves, and less so by their followers, must be multiplied and declared to be *essential* doctrines, to form and strengthen the wall of separation between Christian believers, who without them, would, with regard to the few real essential doctrines of the Christian religion, be of one spirit in the purity and simplicity of the gospel doctrine, and by it be led into the paths of humble faith and genuine piety. This domineering spirit has existed from the first promulgation of the Christian faith; in the dark ages it usurped an entire dominion over the minds of men; and at and since the reformation, the human mind has again been bound in the fetters of human creeds by this anti-christian spirit, which, in preventing the spread of the Gospel, has also been the source of much calamity and irreligion in all parts of the world. That spirit was brought over, was planted, watered, and made to

flourish in this country, and although by the temporary excitements produced by the political disputes with Great Britain, and the war of the revolution, it was checked for a time, it has of late revived with renewed vigour and hopes. This country cannot expect to be exempt from the ordinary, the necessary workings of the human passions; under different forms and appearances they have been the spring of all human actions through all ages. Its political institutions are but of yesterday; what they will prove in their further operation, time alone will bring to light, and no human sagacity can foresee. The human passions have here a free and nearly unbounded scope; and the desire of power is the strongest and the most constant of them all. Your countryman can have no ground to flatter themselves, that no effort toward a supremacy in religion will ever be attempted, and be introduced *in fact*, in spite of their written constitutions; and that in the struggle for political power, religion will not here be made an instrument of ambition, as it has been every where else. Already we see a body established in this country, under the denomination of a General Assembly, with all the features and powers of an aristocracy, which is quietly proceeding by gigantic strides, because it displays the venerable name of religion on its banners; a body not under the check of popular elections, but permanent and renewing itself; having but one object in view, and holding under its influence, by an artful and boldly contrived code of church government and discipline, every minister and member of the sect, in all its subdivisions and ramifications, through the whole extent of the Republic.

Ecclesiastical dominion was established and maintained among all the nations of Europe, by the clergy having succeeded in getting into their hands the public institutions for the education of the people; whereby an ascendancy was gained over their minds, and a blind attachment was secured to a particular creed. In this country, it has already happened, that all the higher institutions for the education of the rising generation, with a very few exceptions, are made subservient to the forming of devotees to one religious denomination, by being placed exclusively in the hands of its ministers, of all others the most zealous, active, ambitious, and intolerant; and who also increase their consideration and influence by taking the lead in other institutions and associations connected with religion.

If the danger to be apprehended to the freedom of religious opinions, in consequence of this potent means of influence, may not as yet be a cause of fear and apprehension through the whole extent of the Republic, two at least, of the most powerful and populous states, are in a fair way to be brought, at no distant time, under their predominant influence, which, when once acquired, must be followed by political power, and will end in persecution. The late virulent attack on the Quakers, a religious denomination deservedly respected every where else, and who in any country had reason, and in this a right, to hope for peace and security, is well calculated to disclose the intolerance of that sect, which, when arguments fail, denounces as *no Christians* all who bend not their knees to their ministers, and do not submit to their creed, and despotic church government. With the religious feelings, and the

146944

fanaticism, existing in this country, no denunciation can be more effectual in depriving the members of those denominations, thus denied the Christian name, of the esteem and good-fellowship of the community, and in making them the objects of contempt and hatred. When this object is once obtained, and a predominance of this sect secured, what will prevent those parts of the country where this has taken place, from seeing renewed those scenes of persecution, which for centuries have desolated the fairest portions of Europe? P.

While we express our thanks to our respected correspondent, for the above interesting and valuable article, we must also beg his indulgence for a few remarks on that part of it, which relates to the religious situation and prospects of this country; as our sentiments on the subject differ so much from his own, that we feel ourselves bound to state them. We confess then, that we cannot agree with him in the alarm which he entertains at the appearance of ecclesiastical domination in the United States. We fully accord with the writer of "Prospects of Unitarianism," in taking a more encouraging view of the matter, and in perceiving every where a decided preponderance of liberal tendencies among our people. Our hopes very much outweigh our apprehensions; we see more light than shade, more benevolence than bigotry, more knowledge than superstition, more of the spirit of freedom than of bondage and fear; and whenever we think of the religious persecutions, and banishments, and deprivations, the establishments, the benefices, the

priestcraft and the kingcraft, of many other countries, we thank God for the toleration, the liberty, and the intelligence of our own, and that we live in a land, where opinion is free, where there are too many sects for one to gain the pre-eminence, where the supreme power is in the hands of the people, and where the people feel too liberally, and know too much, to abuse that power for the detestable purposes of religious intolerance.

And it is not because we trust, any more than our correspondent and friend, to the strength and duration of our written constitutions, that we are led to think thus of the religious prospects of our country. We know that any thing on paper may be burnt at the flaming pile of fanaticism, or torn in pieces by the hands of a misguided mob, or remain a dead letter on the shelf where it is deposited. We look beyond our constitutions to *the spirit of the people*, the spirit which framed them, the spirit which we believe is as generous and as free as when it framed them, and which, we believe, will continue to be so, notwithstanding some local and partial perversions, and in spite of the General Assembly, and the Institution at Andover, and the Seminary at Princeton, and Dr. Spring's Church, and all the bigots in the land.

We are no optimists. We do not look for the reign of universal charity and toleration among us, at present, any more than for one of universal virtue, or universal peace. We have seen, and heard, and felt, enough of the influence of religious pride, proscription, and ignorance; and we expect to see, hear, and feel a great deal more of it while we live. But though this vexes us sometimes, and sometimes makes us sor-

rowful, it does not alarm us; because we see no symptoms of its increase, but rather of its diminution. The influence of better views and better feelings is gradually, though slowly, supplanting it; as the green grass creeps over a spot of sand, or a neglected road. This better influence is produced by the habits, the institutions, and the circumstances of the people and the country. It is not confined in halls, or academies, or meeting-houses; it does not pore in schools, or enact in synods, or denounce from pulpits;—it is a holier and a mightier thing;—it burns in the increasing light of the times, it breathes the air of a free land, it beats in the hearts of free men; it is deep, and wide, and indestructible. And shall the bad spirit prevail against it? We trust not; even though an Assembly should forbid their ministers to think for themselves, and the people to hear what is true; even though an Institution in Andover should oblige its professors to declare every five years, that white is black; and a church in New York should excommunicate one of its members, for believing in the mercy of God.

We say then, that though the effects of spiritual dominion are in some portions of our country confessedly bad, they are not, and cannot be other than partial. Do not we know a gentleman who has been excommunicated, if that be the word, by an ecclesiastical assembly? And does he not continue to preach, and are there not people enough who are glad to hear him? What harm has the excommunication done him? Has it robbed him of his rest, or his food, or his liberty, or of one friend who was worth the keeping? "Doth he feel it? No." And what if the General Assembly should condescend to look down from the high places

where they sit, and denounce ourselves, and put our book on an *Index Expurgatorius?* Would it distress us? We rather think that if the bull of excommunication were not so long as to occupy too many of our pages, "to the exclusion of more valuable matter," we should print it in our Miscellany, for public edification.

And finally, it is our decided and cherished belief, that even if in two or three of our states, an exclusive and persecuting ecclesiastical power should gain a serious ascendancy, it could not be exercised to extremity, or for any length of time. The whole country would cry shame upon it. *Public opinion* would attack it, and public opinion could not be resisted—it is irresistible.

An Eastern Tale.

In the early days of the world, while every thing was yet uncertain, a caravan once crossed a desert, on its way to an unknown land. The company consisted of various parties, and neither of them had been in the country, though they all united in believing it to be the most desirable spot on earth, and its king the mildest and best of governors.

They amused themselves on their journey with drawing pictures of what they were to see, and to enjoy, and with discussing the character of the ruler, under whose sway they were to place themselves. As there were no cities nor land-marks in the desert, they had no other guides than the stars in the heavens; and as the clouds were constantly flitting over these, they dis-

puted about the road which they were to follow. Contention grew high; the character of the prince, to whose land they were journeying, was treated with little ceremony; and opinions, contradictory in themselves, and even sometimes dishonourable to him, were defended with mad earnestness.

No one can tell how far these disputes would have been carried, had not the travellers suddenly found themselves interrupted by a broad river, beyond which they could indistinctly perceive the woods and fields of the desired land, in infinite beauty. Presently a small boat appeared on the water, approached them, and took them in. At this, a deep sleep fell upon them, nor did they awake, till they were already landed on the opposite bank.

On looking round them, they found every thing of exquisite loveliness, but altogether different from their expectations. They inquired for the ruler of the land, and each was sure that now his own opinion was going to be confirmed. But on approaching him, they found him so surrounded by majesty, so arrayed in clemency and benevolence, so possessed of the attributes of power and love, that all their former ideas vanished, and the pride of their hearts sank within them. "Forgive!" exclaimed they all, and threw themselves in the dust. "Forgive!" repeated all, "for we have insulted thy majesty, denied thy perfections, mistaken thy character." Here they were stopped by the good king, who smiling on them, said, "Arise, my children, and fear nothing. I have a large kingdom to govern, and many subjects to make happy. I have no time to hear your excuses; and your opinions have never troubled my peace. You may remain in my territory,

and associate with my subjects; you will find them good instructers. Forget the past, and grow as wise and as happy as you can." And with this he dismissed them.

My friends, we can never find out the Almighty to perfection. We do but know that he exists, and that he loves us, and it becomes us to deport ourselves as humble and obedient subjects.

G. B.

Milton on Heresy.

From his "Treatise of Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Causes."

But we shall not carry it thus. Another Greek apparition stands in our way, *Heresy* and *Heretic;* in like manner also railed at to the people, as in a tongue unknown. They should first interpret to them, that heresy, by what it signifies in that language, is no word of evil note—meaning only the choice or following of any opinion, good or bad, in religion, or any other learning; and thus, not only in heathen authors, but in the New Testament itself, without censure or blame; Acts xv. 5. "Certain of the heresy of the Pharisees which believed;" and xxvi. 5. "After the exactest heresy of our religion, I lived a Pharisee." In which sense presbyterian or independent may without reproach be called a heresy. Where it is mentioned with blame, it seems to differ little from schism; 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19. "I hear that there be schisms among you," &c. "for there must also heresies be among you." Though some who write of heresy after their own heads, would make it far worse than schism; whereas, on the contrary, schism signifies division, and in the

worst sense; heresy, choice only of one opinion before another, which may be without discord. In apostolic times therefore, ere the scripture was written, heresy was a doctrine maintained against the doctrine by them delivered; which in these times can be no otherwise defined than a doctrine maintained against the light, which we now only have of the scripture.

Seeing, therefore, that no man, no synod, no session of men, though called the Church, can judge definitely the sense of scripture to another man's conscience, which is well known to be a general maxim of the protestant religion, it follows plainly, that he who holds in religion that belief, or those opinions, which to his conscience and utmost understanding appear with most evidence or probability in the scripture, though to others he seem erroneous, can no more be justly censured for a heretic than his censurers, who do but the same thing themselves, while they censure him for so doing. For ask them, or any protestant, which hath most authority, the church or the scripture? They will answer, doubtless, that the scripture; and what hath most authority, that no doubt but they will confess is to be followed. He then, who to his best apprehension follows the scripture, though against any point of doctrine by the whole church received, is not the heretic; but he who follows the church against his conscience and persuasion, grounded on the scripture.

To make this yet more undeniable, I shall only borrow a plain simile, the same which our own writers, when they would demonstrate plainest, that we rightly prefer the scripture before the church, use frequently against the papist in this manner. As the Samaritans

believed Christ, first for the woman's word, but next, and much rather for his own, so we the scripture; first on the church's word, but afterwards and much more for its own, as the word of God; yea, the church itself we believe then for the scripture. The inference of itself follows. If by the protestant doctrine we believe the scripture, not for the church's saying, but for its own, as the word of God, then ought we to believe what in our conscience we apprehend the scripture to say, though the visible church, with all her doctors, gainsay; and being taught to believe them only for the scripture, they who so do are not heretics, but the best protestants, and by their opinions, whatever they be, can hurt no protestant, whose rule is not to receive them but from the scripture; which to interpret convincingly to his own conscience, none is able but himself guided by the Holy Spirit; and not so guided, none than he to himself can be a worse deceiver.

To protestants, therefore, whose common rule and touchstone is the scripture, nothing can with more conscience, more equity, nothing more protestantly can be permitted, than a free and lawful debate at all times by writing, conference, or disputation of what opinion soever, disputable by scripture. Concluding, that no man in religion is properly a heretic at this day, but he who maintains traditions or opinions not probable by scripture; who, for aught I know, is the papist only; he the only heretic, who counts all heretics but himself.

Queen Mary's Letter to the Lord Chandois, ordering the manner of Bishop Hooper's Execution.

From Burnet's History of the Reformation.

RIGHT trusty and well beloved, &c. Whereas, John Hooper, who of late was called Bishop of Worcester and Gloucester, is, by due order of the laws ecclesiastic, condemned and judged for a most obstinate, false, detestable Heretic, and committed to our secular power, to be burned, according to the wholesome* and good laws of our realm, in that case provided. Forasmuch, as in those cities, and the diocese thereof, he hath in times past preached and taught most pestilent heresies and doctrine to our subjects there; we have, therefore, given order, that the said Hooper, who yet persisteth obstinate, and hath refused mercy when it was graciously offered, shall be put to execution in the said city of Gloucester, for the example and terror of such as he hath there seduced and mistaught, and because he hath done most harm there. And will that you, calling unto you some of reputation, dwelling in the shire, such as ye think best, shall repair unto our said city, and be at the said execution, assisting our mayor and sheriffs of the same city in this behalf.

And forasmuch also as the said Hooper is, as heretics be, a vain-glorious person, and delighteth in his tongue, and having liberty, may use his said tongue to persuade such as he hath seduced to persist in the miserable opinion that he hath sown among them; our pleasure is, therefore, and we require you to take

* Very wholesome.—Such laws cured all sicknesses.

order, that the said Hooper be neither, at the time of his execution, nor in going to the place thereof, suffered to speak at large; but thither to be led quietly, and in silence, for eschewing further infection, and such inconvenience as may otherwise ensue in this part. Whereof fail not, as ye tender our pleasure.

Objects of Prayer.

"Lord, teach us to pray," is a wish that finds an echo in every pious mind; and from the model of prayer, which our Saviour has left us, we may draw the best general lesson of what should be the legitimate objects of our desires. We are there taught to hallow the name of our heavenly Parent, to rejoice in his government, and to be interested in the progress of his truth, and the accomplishment of all his designs of mercy and love; to enter into the spirit of heaven, and to desire that the obedience of man to the divine will may be as pure, as heartfelt, and sincere, as is that of the angels of God. "Give us this day our daily bread," is all the thought which is bestowed on merely earthly good. We are taught, also, to presume to ask no more mercy from God, and are reminded that we can hope to receive no more, than we habitually extend to our fellow men. We are to pray, in fine, to be guarded from that temptation, which our nature may be too frail to resist; and to be rescued from that evil, which destroys the soul.

We find, therefore, that the principal blessings, which according to this sublime and comprehensive model, we are to ask, are almost wholly spiritual;

that we are to seek first and chiefly the kingdom of God and his righteousness; and that the high aspirings of the Christian are to be after intellectual good. Indeed, when we remember how little we can know of what is really and ultimately best for us, and the system with which we are connected; when we consider the doubtful and fallible nature of what are called the blessings of life, and how much it is the design of the gospel system to control and mortify a carnal spirit, and raise us above the passing pleasures, the corrupt lusts, the low desires, and the unmeaning joys of the world; we must feel that our prayers for merely earthly and temporal blessings should be uttered with the most chastised and submissive temper, and the most entire acquiescence in the wisdom and benignity of Him, who best knows whether to withhold or impart them.

We are not, however, to think ourselves *forbidden* to ask for temporal blessings; on the contrary, to ask for them is not only authorized by many examples in sacred writ, but is obviously attended with many certain and immediately beneficial effects. By praying for health, for success in our callings, for deliverance from evils, we impress on our minds a sense of our dependence on God for these blessings; and remembering at the same time, that the favour of God accompanies, but never supersedes, our own efforts, we may be prompted to use greater diligence and exertion in obtaining and securing these blessings. In the same manner, to pray for the peace, the good order, and prosperity of our country, naturally awakes in us a sense of the value of such blessings, and prompts us to be more active and interested in doing all that lies in us to promote them, and to diffuse, as far as possible, the

same spirit among others. This is a sense in which our country may be allowed to be better for the prayers of a good man, even by those who are not prepared to say, that

> "Perhaps she owes
> Her sunshine, and her rain, her blooming spring,
> And plenteous harvest, to the prayer he makes,
> When Isaac-like, the solitary saint
> Walks forth to meditate at eventide,
> And think on her, who thinks not on herself."

But with whatever reserve we may think it proper to petition for merely earthly good,—for spiritual blessings, for the good of the mind, we hardly need place any bounds to our desires. These are the great objects of a Christian's concern. For these he is not only permitted, but invited to pray to the God of mercies. When he asks for these things, he is sure that he asks for what is truly and eternally good; and that the favour and concurrence of the spirit of God may be securely relied on. Let him, therefore, when he retires to his closet, and shuts it on the cares and vanities of the world; when his faith awakes, and his passions sleep; when a sense of the glorious majesty of God comes over his spirit, and the dread of the Most High falls on him, and the conviction of the sacred presence awes, sanctifies, and elevates his mind—let him pray—let him pray for the goods of this life, for health, prosperity, and joy, with the greatest lowliness, caution, and self-restraint; but let him pour out the pious fervours and strong devotions of his soul, without restraint or fear, for increase of faith, for elevation of hope, and for perfected charity; for purified passions, and resignation of will; for strength in the hour of temptation, and support in the day of trial; for the

calm of innocence, and the joy and peace of believing; for warmer love of God, and more unmingled benevolence to man; for a heart from which every thing evil may be banished, and a mind in which the Spirit of God, and the temper of heaven may dwell.

For blessings like these, he may come boldly to the throne of grace, with full assurance that he shall obtain mercy and grace to help in time of need. For these, let not his prayer be cold and heartless, but earnest, persevering, and from his soul;—such prayer as it becomes a frail, and feeble, and sinful creature to offer, and a God of purity and mercy to hear.

S. C.

The Treasures of the Deep.

From the New Monthly Magazine.

What hid'st thou in thy treasure-caves and cells?
Thou hollow sounding and mysterious main!
—Pale glistening pearls, and rainbow colour'd shells,
Bright things which gleam unreck'd of, and in vain.
—Keep, keep thy riches, melancholy sea!
We ask not such from thee.

Yet more, the depths have more!—What wealth untold,
Far down, and shining through their stillness, lies!
Thou hast the starry gems, the burning gold,
Won from ten thousand royal Argosies.
—Sweep o'er thy spoils, thou wild and wrathful main!
Earth claims not these again!

Yet more, the depths have more!—Thy waves have roll'd
Above the cities of a world gone by!
Sand hath fill'd up the palaces of old,
Sea-weed o'ergrown the halls of revelry!
—Dash o'er them, ocean! in thy scornful play,
Man yields them to decay.

Yet more! the billows and the depths have more!
High hearts and brave are gather'd to thy breast!
They hear not now the booming waters roar;
The battle-thunders will not break their rest.
—Keep thy red gold and gems, thou stormy grave!
Give back the true and brave!

Give back the lost and lovely!—those for whom
The place was kept at board and hearth so long,
The prayer went up through midnight's breathless gloom,
And the vain yearning woke 'midst festal song.
Hold fast thy buried isles, thy towers o'erthrown,
—But all is not thine own!

To thee the love of woman hath gone down,
Dark flow the tides o'er manhood's noble head,
O'er youth's bright locks, and beauty's flowery crown;
—Yet must thou hear a voice—Restore the dead!
Earth shall reclaim her precious things from thee,
Restore the dead, thou sea!

Colman's Dedication Sermon.

In our number for last July, there was a notice of the dedication of a new unitarian church, in Lynn, Massachusetts. The sermon which was preached on that

occasion, by the Rev. Mr. Colman, has since been printed. *The character proper to a Christian Society*, was taken by the preacher as the subject of his discourse, which he divides into the two principal heads of *the proper objects* of such an association, and *the course of conduct by which it should be characterized.* The objects of a christian society are declared to be the intelligent and rational worship of God, the securing of enlightened instruction in religion and morals, and the cherishing of good will and christian fellowship in the community.

With regard to the course of conduct which should characterize a christian society, the first trait is represented to be *independence.* "Let the members of it, says the preacher, "always think, judge, speak, and act for themselves. To think and act for ourselves, however, does not necessarily imply that we are to think and act differently from every one else. It only implies, that having made the most faithful use in our power of the means of knowledge afforded us, we rest our final appeal upon our own reason and conscience, as to our faith and duty. Religion is a concern strictly personal, in which, so long as we do not offend against the wholesome laws and peace of the state, we are responsible only to God." The second characteristic mentioned is *universal charity*, the third *mutual beneficence*, the fourth *seriousness*, and the fifth *purity.*

The following passages form the appropriate conclusion of an excellent discourse.

"This beautiful structure, reared by your skill, industry, and liberality, we now devote to God and to Christ; to the unfettered exercise of that reason, which God has inspired; to the study of those truths, which his works and word reveal; to the maintenance of that charity, with which he has taught us to regard all our brethren of

the human race; to the exercise of that beneficence, which nature suggests and which religion enjoins; and to the cultivation of that moral purity and goodness, which are the great ends of the religion he has given us, and which constitute the splendour and excellence of his own nature.

"May the anathemas of bigotry and intolerance never desecrate this place. May the voice of truth be heard here in all its power, and its light break forth in all its lustre and glory. May the name of Christ here be always honoured and his temper always maintained. May the homage, which is here offered to God, be the purest offering of the understanding and the affections; since God is a spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth. Of many may it be said that they were born to God and to glory here; and when the hands which have reared this edifice are withering in the grave, and the voices which have now filled this temple with the praises of God are mute in death, may it be our felicity to join in offering a purer sacrifice and a more fragrant incense, in a temple 'not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens.'"

We think that the author of this sermon was happy in the choice of his subject, and that he has been equally so in its management; and we only wish that we had room for further extracts.

Transylvania University.

This rising institution has lately been made the object of one of the most generous donations, which the cause of literature in our country has yet received. Col. James Morrison, of Lexington, Kentucky, lately deceased, has left to it by will, the sum of twenty thousand dollars in money, and has made it, beside, his residuary legatee; by which disposition it will obtain, as is supposed, the further sum of forty or fifty thousand dollars.

A discourse, occasioned by the death of this gentleman, was delivered on the nineteenth of last May, in

the Episcopal Church at Lexington, by the Rev. Horace Holley, president of the university. In this discourse, which has been printed, is given a sketch of the life of Col. Morrison, by which we are informed that he was born in Cumberland county, Pennsylvania, in the year 1755; that he entered early into the service of his country, and was for several years a soldier in the revolutionary war. After the peace, he settled in Pittsburgh, in his native state, and became first sheriff of the county of Allegany. He afterwards removed to Kentucky, and commenced business as a merchant in Lexington, in 1792. In 1795, he was appointed commissioner to assign lands to settlers south of the Green river. He was elected a representative to the legislature of the state, in 1797; and soon afterwards was appointed by President Adams, supervisor of the revenue arising from direct and indirect taxes in the district of Kentucky. He was then successively employed in important trusts under the federal government; and as quarter-master-general obtained his titular rank of colonel. The last office which he filled, was that of chairman of the board of trustees of Transylvania University. In all these different places of trust and responsibility, he is represented as having acquitted himself with ability and integrity, and to universal satisfaction. He died on a visit to Washington City, in April, 1823.

We are happy to make an extract from that part of the discourse, which relates to the religious opinions and character of Col. Morrison.

"Colonel Morrison was a christian in his sentiments and practice, but did not consider the peculiarities of any of the sectarian creeds in religion, whether papal or protestant, ancient or modern, as necessary, or as useful, or as ornamental to this character. He had large views and philanthropic feelings, and recognised the wisdom, authori-

ty, goodness, and impartiality of the Deity in all the relations of life, in the wide variety of natural scenery before him, in the temple made without hands as well as in that erected by human art and consecrated to the immediate acts of formal worship, in the ages that are past as well as in those now present, in the foreign city and cottage of the distant gentile, as well as in the metropolis of christendom and the village church of the pious followers of the heaven-directed teacher of Nazareth. With him, a life of virtue was the most acceptable homage to the Deity. He knew and felt that the end of all genuine religion is to make men good, useful, and happy. He ordinarily attended worship in the churches of the Presbyterians, a highly respectable and pious body of christians; but he was entirely eclectic in his principles, taking truth wherever he found it, and giving the hand of fellowship to all good men of every country and denomination. In this respect he invites our imitation, and furnishes us with a suitable occasion to thank our Heavenly Father for the happy formation of his character, for the judicious direction of his opinions, and for the catholic scope of his philanthropic communion."

We are glad to see so honourable a tribute as the discourse of president Holley, paid to the memory of a departed patron of literature. It may remind others of their obligations to society, and proclaim to them how worthy an object it is for the exercise of liberality, to diffuse the light of knowledge and the blessings of instruction among the rapidly increasing population of our country.

Theological Institution at Cambridge.

The public examination of the students of the Theological School at Cambridge, took place there on the twelfth of last August. The audience was larger than any former one on this occasion, and the performances were highly gratifying to the friends of the institution.

The subjects of the dissertations, together with the names of the writers, are as follows.

Junior Class.

1. The Evidence of the Existence of the Writings of the New Testament in the first Century. *By Samuel Presbury.*—2. The Support which Christianity derives from the Martyrdom of the early Christians. *Nathaniel Gage.*

Middle Class.

3. The Character of the Common Version of the New Testament. *Alexander Young.*—4. The Necessary Ambiguity of Language. *Charles W. Upham.*—5. The Grounds of Union among different Sects of Christians. *Edward B. Hall.*—6. The Errors of the early Christians in the Interpretation of Scripture. *Eliphalet P. Crafts.*

Senior Class.

7. The Objection to the Goodness of God, drawn from the Existence of Evil, Natural and Moral. *Calvin Lincoln.*—8. James v. 16; "The effectual, fervent Prayer of a righteous Man availeth much." *Benjamin Kent.*—9. The Importance of the Obligation of positive Institutions in Religion. *Benjamin Hersey.*—10 The Means of a general Revival of practical Religion. *Ezra S. Gannet.*—11. The Value of Revelation, though nothing more be taught by it than is maintained by Unitarian Christians. *William H. Furness.*—12. John i. 29; "The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." *William Farmer.*

Obituary Notice.

From the National Intelligencer.

Died near St. Stephen's, in the state of Alabama, on the third day of June last, Mrs. Amy Toulmin, wife of Mr. John B. Toulmin, of that place. She was born at Falmouth, in Cornwall, England, on the eighteenth day of May, 1789, and out of four beautiful children, lost three soon after her removal to America. A more amiable woman could not easily be found. Pious, mild, gentle, intelligent, she was certainly one of the greatest ornaments of her sex. She was a woman of extraordinary vigour and exertion. Well educated in literature, as well as in morals, she acquired, after the death of her father-in-law, Dr. Joshua Toulmin, pastor of the unitarian church at Birmingham, a knowledge of Weston's most complicated system of shorthand, in which Dr Toulmin's sermons were written. She selected out of several hundred sermons, an octavo volume of most interesting and pathetic discourses. They have reached America.

She was born of a quaker family, and professed the faith of the Friends. Perhaps she was not under the dominion of their full faith and discipline. Certainly she was not an exclusive quaker. She frequented the worship of other Christian churches. Her religion did not consist in dress, in form, or in ceremonies. Yet the quietness of her manners, the zeal of her charity, her diffusive spirit of benevolence, her speedy forgiveness of injuries, though quickly felt at the moment, entitled her to the character of a quaker. No—not exactly; but to the character of an almost perfect Christian. C.

Unitarian Church in Pittsburg.

The church announced in our last number as having been commenced by the Unitarian Society of Pittsburg, has been completed, and was opened for the public worship of the "God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," on Sunday the nineteenth of October.

The services of the day were conducted by the Rev. John Campbell, pastor of the congregation, assisted by the Rev. Mr. Kay, of Northumberland, who delivered a most appropriate and impressive discourse, from John iv. 24. "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth."

We congratulate our fellow Christians on the increasing liberality of sentiment and spirit of inquiry, manifested on the present occasion, by the very numerous and respectable audience which attended, and the desire of great numbers to hear, who could not gain admittance for want of room.

Cold Preaching.

The English clergy have been often charged with a cold and unimpressive manner of preaching. They can at least plead ancient authority for it. The following paragraph is from a set of instructions given by Bonner, bishop of London, to his clergy.

"Furthermore; that no preacher shall rage or rail in his sermon, but *coldly*, discreetly, and charitably, open, declare, and set forth, the excellency of virtue, and to suppress the abomination of sin and vice."

UNITARIAN MISCELLANY

AND

CHRISTIAN MONITOR.

No. XXXVI.] DECEMBER, 1823. [Vol. V.

Doctrine of two Natures in Christ.

It is one objection to the doctrine of the Trinity, that it ascribes two natures to Jesus Christ; that not content with representing God as existing in three distinct persons, it divides one of those persons, by assigning to him a divine and a human nature. This extraordinary doctrine is a necessary consequence of the trinity, and is, we think, one of the greatest incumbrances with which it is loaded. If the former be overthrown, the latter falls with it. We consider it peculiarly unfortunate for the advocates of the trinity, that their hypothesis involves a supposition, which is attended with all the formidable difficulties with which the doctrine of two natures in Christ is surrounded.

We shall proceed to state more explicitly, what is understood by this doctrine at the present day, and bring into view some of the most important objections to it, after offering a few observations upon its origin and growth in the earlier ages of the church.

The simple doctrines of Christianity became disfigured by a mixture of human falsehood and error, in

Unitarian Church in Pittsburg.

The church announced in our last number as having been commenced by the Unitarian Society of Pittsburg, has been completed, and was opened for the public worship of the "God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," on Sunday the nineteenth of October.

The services of the day were conducted by the Rev. John Campbell, pastor of the congregation, assisted by the Rev. Mr. Kay, of Northumberland, who delivered a most appropriate and impressive discourse, from John iv. 24. "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth."

We congratulate our fellow Christians on the increasing liberality of sentiment and spirit of inquiry, manifested on the present occasion, by the very numerous and respectable audience which attended, and the desire of great numbers to hear, who could not gain admittance for want of room.

Cold Preaching.

The English clergy have been often charged with a cold and unimpressive manner of preaching. They can at least plead ancient authority for it. The following paragraph is from a set of instructions given by Bonner, bishop of London, to his clergy.

"Furthermore; that no preacher shall rage or rail in his sermon, but *coldly*, discreetly, and charitably, open, declare, and set forth, the excellency of virtue, and to suppress the abomination of sin and vice."

THE

UNITARIAN MISCELLANY

AND

CHRISTIAN MONITOR.

No. XXXVI.] DECEMBER, 1823. [Vol. V.

Doctrine of two Natures in Christ.

It is one objection to the doctrine of the Trinity, that it ascribes two natures to Jesus Christ; that not content with representing God as existing in three distinct persons, it divides one of those persons, by assigning to him a divine and a human nature. This extraordinary doctrine is a necessary consequence of the trinity, and is, we think, one of the greatest incumbrances with which it is loaded. If the former be overthrown, the latter falls with it. We consider it peculiarly unfortunate for the advocates of the trinity, that their hypothesis involves a supposition, which is attended with all the formidable difficulties with which the doctrine of two natures in Christ is surrounded.

We shall proceed to state more explicitly, what is understood by this doctrine at the present day, and bring into view some of the most important objections to it, after offering a few observations upon its origin and growth in the earlier ages of the church.

The simple doctrines of Christianity became disfigured by a mixture of human falsehood and error, in

times not very remote from the days of the apostles. The followers of Jesus soon ceased to honour their master as the favoured messenger, through whom the Father had spoken and made displays of power to men, and employed themselves in abstruse speculations about his rank and person. In their attempts to exalt his nature, they forgot the gratitude and respect, which were due to him as a teacher of the will of God. their duty, and their prospects, as a guide and example to direct them on their way, encourage their virtue, and confirm their faith and hopes by submitting to the cross, and rising from the dead. He was revered by those of his disciples who attended him, or occasionally listened to his instructions, as one invested with miraculous power and wisdom; but no sooner had he left the earth, than the imagination or philosophy of the new converts began to throw around his person various disguises, which weakened the effect of those simple and grand virtues which marked his character. The prophet of Nazareth was viewed as God, having only the appearance of a man, by the heretical Docetœ; and regarded as a man, with whom one of the œons or divine intelligences became united at baptism, and whom he forsook immediately before his sufferings, by the no less heretical Cerinthians.

A doctrine somewhat resembling the trinity of later ages was at length struck out, and gradually obtained currency. On the subject of this doctrine, however, the opinions of the fathers of the three first centuries appear to have been somewhat indefinite and fluctuating. Different individuals entertained views, variously modified by their former habits of thinking, conceptions and prejudices. These views were stated by each one in his

own way, and often loosely or carelessly expressed; or if, in a few instances, forms of expression in general use were adhered to, they had never been fully explained, or accurately investigated, and therefore were far from being always understood, or having at all times the same force.*

Arius, having early in the fourth century published opinions, which were deemed false and dangerous by the predominant party, the council of Nice was assembled, A. D. 325, to suppress the growing heresy, and settle the faith of future ages. The labours of this council resulted in the production of the well known document, called the Nicene Creed, in which the Son is declared to be "of one substance with the Father,† very God of very God," "who came down from heaven, and was incarnate, and was made flesh."

The Deity of the Son being acknowledged, it next became an inquiry, in what manner the divine and

* The want of uniformity and precision in the sentiments of the Ante-Nicene Fathers on the subject of the Trinity, is acknowledged by the learned Jesuit Petavius, who was not deficient in tenderness and respect for the Fathers of his church. Dogmata Theologica, tom. ii. lib. i. cap. iii. et iv.

† Ὁμοουσιον τῳ Πατρι. The expression in the original is not wholly free from ambiguity. Ὁμοουσιον, the term used to express the *consubstantiality* of the Son with the Father, appears to have been employed by the Platonics and Platonizing Fathers, to express, not a numerical, but only a specific identity—not that one thing was numerically of the same substance with another, but partook of the same nature. In this sense it seems to have been employed by the Fathers of the Nicene Council. Succeeding ages, while they have retained the language, have departed from the sentiments of these Fathers. Petavius, in his Dog. Theol. tom. ii. lib. iv. cap. v. has brought together a great mass of learning, on the origin and use of the term ὁμοουσιον. See also Eusebii Cœs. Epistola, extant in Socrates, Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. viii. and Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. xii.

human natures were united in him, and what were the consequences of the union. Were all the attributes of both natures preserved unaltered, so that there were two distinct natures united in one person? Or were they blended and changed, in such a manner as to form a new nature? If so, what was this new nature resulting from the union of perfect God with entire humanity? These questions gave rise to perpetual controversies, which occasioned much waste of time, and loss of temper.

Arius had been accused of degrading the Son. Apollinaris, or Apollinarius, the younger, who became the author of a widely diffused heresy about the year 370, seems to have been driven by the horror of Arianism into the worse extreme of supposing, that Christ did not possess proper humanity; that he had not a rational, but only a sensitive soul, the Deity supplying the place of the former; and consequently that the Divinity suffered and died with him on the cross.* To this Apollinaris is attributed the expression, *there*

Eusebius, it will be recollected, was present in the Council, and offered the draft of a creed, which was adopted with a few trifling alterations, and some additions, the most important of which was that of the word ὁμοουσιον. The expressions proposed to be substituted or added, he observes, were not adopted without being deliberately weighed. By the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, nothing more was meant, he says, than that he bore no resemblance to the creatures made by him, but was similar in all respects, to the Father, by whom he was begotten; nor was he of any other hypostasis and substance, but of that of the Father. Some remarks on this subject may be found also in Clerici Ars. Crit. P. ii. s. 1. cap. xv. 16, 21, and Epist. 2. tom. iii. p. 34 et seq. Also, Biblioth. Anc. et Mod. tom. xxvi. p. 264.

* Theodoret. lib. v. cap. iii. et x. Petav. Dog. Theol. tom. v. lib. i. cap. vi. Cave, Script. Eccles. Hist. Lit. p. 158.

is but one incarnate nature in Christ; an unfortunate expression, which lighted up the flame of controversy, and occasioned schisms, which succeeding ages have not been able to repress.—The doctrine of the incarnation and its consequences were subjects of debate among the Fathers, and called forth decrees of councils, particularly in the three following centuries. It was a nice point to mark the *distinction* and *union* of the two natures in Christ, and preserve the latter without destroying the former.

Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, A. D. 428, and founder of the powerful sect of Nestorians, alarmed at the absurd consequences which followed the supposition of Apollinaris, and desirous of shunning the error of confounding the two *natures*, was betrayed into the use of expressions, which were thought to imply the existence of two *persons* in Jesus Christ. He was disgusted with the expression, "mother of God," which it was then becoming customary to apply to Mary. He considered it more proper to call her "mother of Christ." He was shocked too at the idea, that God had suffered and died. He acknowledged that perfect God was indissolubly united with perfect man in Jesus Christ; but the language which he frequently employed appeared to his adversaries consistent only with the supposition, that this union was very slight and feeble; and they could not discover, how the personal unity of the Saviour was preserved, while the divine and human natures remained distinct, as he described them to be. After some unsuccessful attempts had been made to induce him to retract his opinion, a general council was assembled at Ephesus,

A. D. 431, by which he was, in a tumultuous manner, condemned and deposed for heresy.*

Eutyches had acquired fame at the Council of Ephesus, by strenuously combatting the errors of Nestorius; and as the latter was accused of dividing the *person*, the former was soon after censured for confounding the *natures* of Jesus Christ, and in turn subjected to the anathemas of the church. Eutyches was the Superior of a convent at Constantinople, and became conspicuous for heresy about the year 448. He maintained, in opposition to the doctrine of two natures in Jesus Christ, then esteemed catholic, that after the incarnation, the divine and human natures became blended in such a manner, that there remained only one nature in Christ, the divine nature having, as it was expressed, absorbed the human. This opinion rapidly spread, particularly in Egypt, but proved to the orthodox fathers equally unpalatable with the opposite errors of Nestorius,† and Eutyches was summoned before a

* The sentence of the Council was, not long after, confirmed by the Emperor Theodosius; and the unfortunate heresiarch was compelled to fly from Constantinople, being exiled first to Petra in Arabia, and afterwards to Oasis in the deserts of Lybia; and after wandering in different places, and experiencing a variety of fortunes, for some years, died worn out by fatigue and hardship. His enemies gave currency to a report, that his tongue was "eaten out by worms," a token, they supposed, of the vengeance of heaven drawn down upon him by his blasphemies. Evagrius, Eccles. Hist. lib. i. cap. ii.—vii. Cave, Hist. Lit. p. 266. "He was buried," says Gibbon, "in a city of Upper Egypt, but the immortal malice of the Jacobites has persevered for ages, to cast stones against his sepulchre, and to propagate the foolish tradition, that it was never watered by the rain of heaven."

† After all, it may be doubted, whether the authors of the Nestorian, and Eutychian or Monophysite heresies differed very materially in their opinions. They employed different expressions, struck out in

council assembled at Constantinople, A. D. 448, by which he was condemned, deprived of his sacerdotal office, removed from the government of his monastery, and cut off from the communion of the church. He was afterwards absolved and restored, and they who had been active in procuring his deposition, were anathematized by a council assembled at Ephesus, A. D. 449, conducted with somewhat more than usual irregularity and violence. He was allowed, however, only a short respite. He was again anathematized by the Council of Chalcedon, the fourth general or œcumenical council, A. D. 451. This council claims the merit of having ascertained and settled the doctrine of the incarnation, which, according to its creed, is in substance as follows. Jesus Christ is truly God and man, perfect in both natures, consubstantial with the Father with respect to his divinity, and consubstantial with us with respect to his humanity.* The two natures, the divine and

the heat of controversy, and thought, that their opinions had as little in common with each other as their language. See Le Clerc, Biblioth. Anc. et Mod. tom. xxviii. p. 265, 268. Biblioth. Univ. et Hist. tom. viii. p. 340; xxi. 19. Those who wish to pursue the inquiry relating to the above mentioned heresies, will find ample materials in the learned work of Petavius, already referred to, of which the fifth and sixth volumes, comprising more than seven hundred folio pages, are devoted to the subject of the incarnation.

* The expression in the original, as given by Evagrius, lib. ii. cap. 4, and Petav. Dog. Theol. tom. v. lib. ii. cap. ii. 6, is ὁμοουσιον τῳ Πατρι κατα την Θεοτητα, και ὁμοουσιον ημιν τον αυτον κατα την ανθρωποτητα. Upon which Dr. Jortin observes, "From this remarkable expression, (if these Fathers knew what they said,) it may be inferred, that by *consubstantiality* they meant to establish a *generical*, and not a *numerical* identity of substance."—Remarks on Ecclesiastical History, vol. iv. p. 295. Le Clerc has a

human, are indissolubly united in him without confusion or change, each retaining all its former attributes, yet so united as to form one person.*

The doctrine of the union of the divine and human natures in Jesus Christ, as held by the orthodox of succeeding ages, and received by trinitarians of the present day, does not differ, in any important particulars, from that established by the council of Chalcedon. As a specimen of the veneration, with which the decrees of this council were regarded by the old English divines of eminence, we subjoin in a note some remarks of Dr. Barrow, one of the most profound and clear-sighted of them all.†—The Church of England, which though not

similar observation, Biblioth. Anc. et Mod. tom. xxvi. p. 265. See our remarks on the term ὁμοουσιον in a preceding note. The sarcasm of Jortin is not wholly unmerited; the Fathers were not remarkable for discernment and accuracy.

* It came afterwards naturally enough to be a question, whether after the union of the two natures in Christ, there was in him *one will and operation*, as it was expressed, or *two*. The sect called Monothelites, which arose about the year 630, maintained, that after this union, there was in Christ only one will and one operation. This opinion was condemned by the third Council of Constantinople, the sixth general council, holden A. D. 680; Pope Honorius, who had been tainted with it, and now several years dead, was among others anathematized, and the doctrine which teaches, that in Jesus Christ there are two wills and two energies, was established.—Petav. Dog. Theol. tom. v. lib. i. cap. xix. et seq. et lib. viii. passim.

† "We may, with the holy Fathers, and particularly with the great Council of Chalcedon, assert that in the incarnation of our Lord, the two natures, the divine and human, were united ασυγχυτως, &c.

"The natures were, I say, united, ασυγχυτως, that is, without any confusion or commixion; for such a way of blending would induce a third nature different from both; such a commixion being supposed, our Lord would be neither God nor man, but another third kind of substance, that would destroy, diminish or alter the properties of each;

absolutely infallible, never errs, following in the steps of the unreformed Catholic church, determines that, "the son—took man's nature—so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man." Article second.—It is added by an expositor, "the essential properties of one nature were not communicated to the other nature—each kept his respective properties distinct, without the least confusion in their most intimate union."*

"In whatever way," says Professor Stuart, "the union of the two natures was effected, it neither destroyed nor essentially changed either the divine or the human nature." He supposes Christ to be God omniscient and omnipotent; and still a feeble man of imperfect knowledge."†

It is unnecessary to add more to show what the received opinion on this subject is.—The doctrine of the

which is unsound to say, and impossible to be; wherefore both natures in this mystery do subsist entire, distinct and unconfused, each retaining its essential and natural properties."

After some further remarks of a similar character, he adds, "The natures were joined undividedly;—there is but one *Christ*, one person, to whom, being God, and being man, are truly and properly attributed."

"The same person never ceased to be both God and man; not even then, when our Lord as man did undergo death; for he raised himself from the dead, he reared the temple of his own body, being fallen; as being God he was able to raise himself, as being man he was capable of being raised by himself; the union between God and man persisting, when the union between human body and soul was dissolved."—Works, vol. ii. p. 255. Ed. 1716.

* Prettyman, Elements of Christian Theology, vol. 2.

† Letter Second.

union of two natures in the person of Jesus Christ, in the form in which it is stated in the above extracts, is admitted, as far as we know, by all genuine trinitarians. No one of them doubts, that Christ was perfect man; no one of them professes to doubt that he was also perfect God. According to this doctrine, when fairly stated, an infinite nature with all its essential attributes of omniscience, omnipotence, necessary and everlasting existence, incapable of suffering or change, was indissolubly united in the person of Jesus Christ with a finite nature, with all its properties, as imperfect knowledge, weakness, fallibility, exposure to sorrow, pain and death, in such a manner, that the two natures remain for ever distinct, each retaining unaltered all its former attributes.

This extraordinary doctrine furnishes, in the opinion of trinitarians, an explanation of two opposite classes of expressions in the New Testament, one of which, they think, establishes the fact, that he is God, and the other, they are compelled to acknowledge, taken alone, favours the supposition, that he was a being distinct from God and inferior to him. Having assumed the doctrine of his supreme divinity as proved, and not being able to resist the fact, that much is said and done by him, and many things observed concerning him by the historians of his life and death, which have a manifest impropriety, we may say, glaring absurdity, upon any other supposition but that of his inferiority, in some sense, to the Father—much which *they* think proves him to have possessed entire humanity, they perceive the difficulties by which they are surrounded, and attempt to escape by saying, that he had both a divine and a human nature; that he some-

times acted and spoke in one, and sometimes in the other, of these natures; that when he said, for instance, that he did not know at what time an event was to take place, he must be understood as referring to his human nature, and as intending to say, that he did not know it as man, although he knew it perfectly as God; that when he is described as having infirmities, and tasting of sorrows and death, these things are said of him as man. Whatever language, impressions, feelings and actions are attributed to him, which cannot be ascribed to him simply as God, must, it is affirmed, be attributed to his human nature.

Such is the famous "key," as it has been called, by the help of which the Scriptures are said to be rendered intelligible and easy.

Now to this hypothesis there are several strong objections, some of the principal of which we propose to state in our next number.

A. L.

Attacks on the Characters of Unitarians.

THIRTY years ago the late Dr. Andrew Fuller published a book, in which he undertook to point out the immoral tendency of Socinianism. With this view he asserted that Socinians entertain low and diminutive notions of the evil of sin, and that they caress persons who have similar ideas in regard to sin. In support of these allegations, he professed to refer to Dr. Priestley's work on Philosophical Necessity, but instead of quoting it fairly, he began by substituting his own words for Dr. Priestley's language; he then intro-

duced an extract really taken from the Doctor's work, but omitted the beginning of the paragraph, and broke off before it was concluded, so that it does not appear to his readers, that in this quotation Dr. Priestley was not treating of sin, but of philosophical necessity, which implies a chain of causes and effects. To complete the climax of misrepresentation, he incorporated with this partial extract a passage from the writings of Dr Hartley, which Dr. Priestley had quoted in a preceding part of his work on philosophical necessity, containing the author's (Dr. H.'s) inferences from the belief of a life after death, and of universal restitution. By this kind of management, he has given the appearance of plausibility to his assertion, that Socinians make light of sin.

Although several writers have noticed Dr. Fuller's work, particularly the late Dr. Toulmin, and Mr. Kentish who is still living, the facts now stated, the proofs of which may easily be had by reference to the works themselves, do not appear to have been brought into public view; though had they been substantiated by extracts, and references to the pages from which they were taken, a complete exposure would have been made. It is to be regretted that this was not done at an early period after the publication of Dr. Fuller's book. But Unitarians have been reluctant to notice general charges against their moral and religious characters, professing to be the followers of him, who, when he was reviled, reviled not again. Or they may be inclined to rest their defence on facts, which, as the late John Wesley well observed, are stubborn things. If so, the exemplary characters of Drs. Kippis, Price, Priestley, and Disney, and of Theo-

philus Lindsey, and other worthies now departed, but who were all actively engaged in the christian ministry, when Dr. Fuller's work first appeared in print, might be deemed a practical refutation of the allegations made against Socinianism as hostile to genuine piety; for it is reasonable to expect, that had such been its tendency, this must have appeared in the tempers and lives of its most zealous and distinguished advocates.

The author of Letters on Unitarianism, a work lately published in this country, treads in the footsteps of Dr. Fuller; but he adduces no facts to substantiate his allegations against Unitarianism. His opinion is freely given and frequently reiterated; but we look in vain for the evidence of established facts. In one respect, however, he has gone beyond his predecessor, and, so far, is entitled to the credit of originality. I allude to the comparison which he has made between the fabled syrens and the influence of unitarians. Lest your readers should not have access to Dr. Miller's work, not only this passage, but one or two other passages, on which some observations are now to be made, will be transcribed at full length.

"Unitarianism will give less pain to natural feelings, will call for less self-denial, and will more readily accommodate itself to every sort of pursuit and habit, except that which is right, than any other scheme which calls itself by the name of christianity." pages 16, 17.

"Deliberately believing, as I do, that the system of the unitarians is nothing less than a total denial and subversion of the christian religion, and that, so far as they gain an influence, it is like that of the fabled syrens of old, to allure but to destroy, it is impossible

for me to think of making terms with such a system." Again, "Wo is me, if I consent for a moment, to parley with those who blaspheme the name of the ever blessed Redeemer, or would degrade his religion." page 19.

"The truth is, if I had no concern for the everlasting welfare of my children, I could no more consent that they should be brought up under unitarian influence, or in unitarian institutions, than I could to place them under the direction of the avowed teachers of frigid and cheerless scepticism. Nay, I am compelled seriously to doubt, whether it ought not to be deemed less dangerous to commit a youth to the tuition of an avowed infidel, than to that of one who would be zealous in endeavouring to instil into his mind the principles of a corrupt and delusive system, under the name of the christian religion. When I consider the tendency of unitarian sentiments, especially in some of their prevalent modifications, equally to take away the most powerful motives to virtue, and the strongest barriers against vice, I should certainly feel as if, in committing my children to such guidance, I was exposing them to double danger;—danger, I mean, of temporal, no less than spiritual ruin." page 308.

Truly, if these are the fruits of Unitarianism, the preference which the reverend professor appears disposed to give to an avowed infidel as an instructer of his children, is judicious and worthy of imitation, and the community at large are under great obligations to him, for the exposure which he has made of Unitarianism. That such are the feelings of the body to which he belongs, may be fairly inferred from the commendations bestowed on his work in the Presbyterian Ma-

gazine; where it is said, that he has shown "much candour and christian meekness." It is true, that he has not used the term *Socinian*, as descriptive of unitarians, but which is inapplicable to them; and he is willing that they should be treated as sober deists in disguise; which, considering that he represents them as more dangerous than deists, is going a great way to keep them in good humour. Still, notwithstanding all this appearance of civility, the great body of the work, from which the preceding paragraphs have been extracted, abounds with assertions injurious to the characters of unitarians; and the comparison of them to the fabled syrens, with the remark relative to *temporal* ruin, as resulting from unitarian sentiments, hold up the idea in language sufficiently obvious, that young men who are possessed of property, will do well to avoid coming into close contact with unitarians, at least with those unitarians, who are zealous for Unitarianism. If this is not what is meant, I acknowledge that the comparison of unitarians to syrens, is to me unintelligible; nor will it be easy to attach any meaning to the passage in which the syrens are mentioned. If it be thought surprising, that the professor should be so willing to prefer infidel to unitarian influence, it ought to be recollected, that more than twenty years ago, in a letter to a reverend brother, relative to the candidates for the presidency of the United States, he scrupled not to declare that he would prefer a democratic infidel to a christian aristocrat. Not having the newspaper before me which contained this letter, I may not be technically accurate as to the precise phraseology used, but I am strictly correct as to the sentiment expressed.

Were the unitarians disposed to retaliate, they might ask several home and searching questions when they find a minister of the christian religion attaching more importance to the *politics* than to the *Christianity* of the first magistrate of the union. Assuredly, this is no very decisive proof of zeal in the cause of *Christ*, and it is not a little remarkable that strictures on the unitarians, on account of their alleged want of vital piety, should come from this quarter. But I am not disposed to press the matter farther; your readers will form their own conclusions. Let us hope that the gentleman has seen his error, although he has not made such an acknowledgment.

On one point, the author of the Letters on Unitarianism is at issue with some of his brethren. He declares, that Unitarianism "is *nothing less* than a *total* denial and subversion of the Christian religion." His friend, Dr. Romeyn, in a discourse delivered about six years ago, said that "they throw away *full three-fourths* of the word of God;"—and even in the Christian Magazine, although, under the misnomer Socinians, unitarians were accused of "absolutely stripping the gospel of every principle which makes it glad tidings to a sinner," this qualification was inserted "*with the single exception of the doctrine of the resurrection;*—which doctrine Romeyn says, in the discourse just referred to, is the corner stone of Christianity.—So much for the agreement between the professor and some of his most distinguished brethren; according to whom, bad as the heresy of Unitarianism is, it embraces, as an article of faith, one truth which is the corner stone of Christianity.

Let us now inquire how stands the case as a matter of *fact*. Since the gentleman declares what he asserts to be his deliberate belief, when he states that "the system of the unitarians is nothing less than a total denial and subversion of the Christian religion;" if he is correct in this declaration, it necessarily follows, that he and they do not hold a single article of belief in common as regards Christian faith. Unitarians believe all that our Lord taught, as recorded by the four Evangelists, and all that is related concerning him. They receive him as the true Messiah, and confess that he is Lord, to the glory of God, the Father. They hold it to be their duty to embrace his religion, to obey his precepts, to imitate his example, to rely on his declarations and promises, and, as becomes those who confess that they are pilgrims and strangers on the earth, and whose citizenship is in heaven, not to be conformed to this world, but to set their affections on things above, to walk by faith, and by a patient continuance in well doing, to seek for glory, honour, and immortality.

This is a faint, and very imperfect outline of the system, which, according to Dr. Miller, "is nothing less than a total denial and subversion of the Christian religion," and which "will more readily accommodate itself to every sort of pursuit, except that which is right, than any other scheme which calls itself by the name of Christianity." And the adherents of this system are said to blaspheme the name, and degrade the religion of Jesus Christ!

If indeed, under the profession of Christianity, and of a peculiar degree of zeal for its purity and advancement, they indulged themselves in such language as has

now been quoted and referred to, when speaking of believers in the Trinity, universal and inherent depravity, imputed sin, and imputed righteousness, I know not what could be offered in vindication of their conduct; and if the apostolic decision as to an unbridled tongue, (James i. 26,) is to be extended to an unbridled pen, they would have just cause to fear lest their apparent zeal had been kindled at an unhallowed altar.

I have long been in the expectation and hope that some public notice would be taken of the Letters on Unitarianism, and more especially of the passages which have been inserted in this article; not because the work contains much matter, but because it is well calculated for the perusal of that numerous class of readers, who are easily carried away by plausible representations; and because charges the most serious and unfounded are presented to view again and again, in language so smooth, and with professions so solemn, as to lead the inexperienced and unreflecting to lend a ready ear, and to give entire assent, to the representations and positions of the author.

My expectation was the more natural, because the farewell discourse of Dr. Mason had been the subject of immediate animadversion. Yet, although in some few passages its language was violent, it did not contain either assertions or insinuations derogatory to the *integrity* and *moral honesty* of unitarians.—Why then this difference of procedure? True, it is rather an ungracious task to reply to attacks on character, and where individuals only are implicated, the answer of a good conscience may be preferable to any effort by the pen; but, here, the attack was not on any specified *individuals*, but general and indiscriminate as regarded

the body of unitarians, who were branded as blasphemers.*

The time was, when the crime of blasphemy consisted in cursing Jehovah; but according to the theology of some masters in our Israel, it is blasphemy to worship any other than a trinity of persons in the Godhead. In other words, the disciples of Pope Damasus, who give glory to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, are devout and acceptable worshippers, and are alone entitled to the Christian name; but the followers of Jesus Christ, who worship the Father, are not true worshippers; his holiness aforesaid having appointed a formula essentially different from that which our Lord taught his disciples.

It would be easy to enlarge, but I trust enough has been said to show how groundless and untenable are the assertions made against Unitarianism, as a system calculated to render men at ease while in a state of wilful and allowed sin. The characters of individuals, whether trinitarians or unitarians, are not topics for public discussion. The truly conscientious of both classes mourn over their fallen brethren. I will only add, that as the author of the Letters on Unitarianism is a believer in universal and inherent depravity, the sins of unitarians might as easily be accounted for from the corruption of their nature, as the sins of those of his own body; for, although *they* do not urge this as an extenuation of their sins, nor as a cause contributing to make them sinners, those who believe these things ought, in strict justice, to apply to them the same standard by which they judge of themselves. J. T.

* We believe ourselves authorized to state that a work will soon be put to press in Boston, which will take as much notice of Dr. Miller's Letters as they deserve. Ed.

Nature and Design of the Lord's Supper.

Regarding the authority of the Lord's Supper as proved by what has been already advanced, and considering it, therefore, as an established rite of our religion, we are next to inquire into *the nature and design* of that rite. If we are satisfied that it is a positive institution of Christianity, we are concerned and required, as Christians, to know what it means and for what purpose it was instituted.

Such an inquiry is of course to be determined by a knowledge of the founder's intention, and that intention is to be discovered from his recorded words. If there be any better way of judging of the nature of the Lord's Supper than from the design of our Lord in its institution, or any better way of learning that design than from his own declarations, I am not acquainted with it, nor can I conceive of it.

The words of Jesus on this solemn occasion have already been quoted. They are few and simple; and though as given to us by the evangelists there are slight differences between them, their sense may be fairly expressed thus; "This bread is my body which is soon to be broken for you on the cross; let it be eaten in remembrance of me. And this cup is my blood which is soon to bé shed for you; drink it in remembrance of me." What is here mentioned as the design of the ceremony? Is it not remembrance, and remembrance only? Is any other design intimated? Can any other be discovered? These are plain words, and subject to but one interpretation; and they are the words of our Saviour.

It is true that many Christians, a great majority indeed of the Christian church, take the expressions, "This is my body," and "This is my blood," in their literal sense, and regard the bread and wine which are used in the communion as the real body and blood of Christ. I do not intend to examine this opinion at present; I shall consider it hereafter. I notice it now for the purpose of observing, that whatever those substances are which we eat and drink, we eat and drink them simply and solely in remembrance of our Master. This is an important conclusion. We cannot bear it too strictly in mind that there is but one object declared in this rite, whatever we may believe to be the proper manner of its celebration, or the true nature of its elements. Whether we regard the substances of which we partake as merely bread and wine; whether we believe them to be the real body and blood of Christ, or whether, according to another class of Christians, we believe them to be both bread and flesh, wine and blood; still we cannot, without adding to what is written, partake of them for any other purpose than that of calling to remembrance our crucified and ascended Lord. If we are as thoroughly convinced of this point as we ought to be, the conviction will greatly contribute to simplify all our ideas on the subject. It is evident from the words of our Saviour, that the rite of his Supper was designed by him to keep alive in his disciples the memory of what he had done and suffered for them. "Do this," he says, "in remembrance of me." Why then do we hear of so many other designs and purposes? Why have men sought out so many inventions, and crowded them on the simplicity of the gospel?

As it is possible, however, that the occasion on which the Supper was instituted may point us to some other design in its celebration, it will be proper to inquire into the circumstances of that occasion. The night on which Jesus was betrayed was that on which the Jews kept their feast of the Passover; and it was while celebrating this national rite that he instituted his own. Now if we ask what was the design of that ceremony of the Jewish ritual, we have an immediate answer in the words of the Jewish lawgiver, Moses. After acquainting the people with the manner in which this feast was to be observed, he says, "And this day shall be unto you for a *memorial;* and you shall keep it a feast unto the Lord throughout your generations, and you shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever." "For," as he soon afterward adds, "in this self same day have I brought your armies out of Egypt; *therefore* shall ye observe this day in your generations by an ordinance forever." And again, speaking of the time when the same rite should be celebrated in the promised land, he says, "And thou shalt show thy son in that day, saying, This is done because of that which the Lord did unto me, when I came forth out of Egypt. And it shall be for a sign unto thee upon thine hand, and for a memorial between thine eyes, that the Lord's law may be in thy mouth; for with a strong hand hath the Lord brought thee out of Egypt." We gather from these passages, and from others which might be brought to confirm them, that the design of the feast of the Passover, so far from being in any way different from the design of the Lord's Supper, as stated in the words of our Saviour, does, on the contrary, most *strikingly* coincide with it. Both of these institutions,

o use the word of the Old Testament, are *memorials;* he one being a memorial of the deliverance of the Israelites from the bondage of the Egyptians, and the other a memorial of the deliverance of a world from the bondage of sin, misery, and death.

Although the design of these two rites is thus similar, however, it would be a misapprehension to suppose them the same in all respects, or that the Christian ordinance is a continuation of the Jewish festival. The passover was *a feast upon sacrifice*, as it is termed; that is to say, they who united in its celebration, partook of something which had been sacrificed; in the Christian rite, this is obviously not the case. In the passover, there was but one thing, the paschal lamb, to be partaken of; in the Lord's supper, there are two, bread and wine. Though there is so great a similarity of design in these two rites, therefore, there is not such a resemblance between them in other respects, as to lead us to the supposition, that this ceremony of the Jews was continued by our Saviour, with a slight modification, as a rite of his own religion.

But while I am on this portion of my subject, it will be proper to mention, that it is highly probable that the Christian sacrament of the supper, though it be not really the same with the Jewish passover, was yet borrowed from some of the circumstances, which usage had incorporated with its celebration. We are told by Bishop Pearce, in his second letter to Waterland, that it was a custom among the Jews, in all their public festivals, "for the master of the house, when his guests were set down, to bless bread and then break it, and give a piece of it to every one at table; and so after supper to take a cup of wine, and having blessed

it, and drank of it himself, to give it round for the guests to drink likewise. Hence came the phrase of κλασις του αρτου, and hence that of ποτηριον ευλογιας, the cup of blessing, the same with the grace cup, and which was their closing cup." With regard to the particular festival of which we are speaking, Dr. Lightfoot informs us, that as soon as the guests were assembled to eat the passover, and had seated themselves at the table, the master of the house took a cup of wine, over which he said a certain appointed thanksgiving and then passed it round to his guests. After this, and when they had eaten a little, they partook of a second cup, over which appointed psalms were rehearsed. Then the host took bread, and repeating a thanksgiving over it, broke it, ate a piece of it himself, and distributed it among those who were present. Having eaten of the paschal lamb itself, they tasted of a third cup of wine, which, on account of the particular thanksgivings said over it, was emphatically called *the cup of blessing*. Other psalms and prayers being repeated, a fourth cup concluded the ceremony.

We can have little doubt, after being acquainted with these particulars, that our Lord founded his own rite on this common practice of the Jews in celebrating their feast of the passover. He probably introduced it in the following manner. When, according to the usual custom, he distributed bread to his disciples, he appropriated it to his designed purpose by saying, "Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me." And when, after they had eaten of the paschal lamb, he presented to them the cup which was distinguished by the appellation of

the cup of blessing, he made this action also a part of his ordinance, by adding, "Drink ye all of it, for this cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for many for the remission of sins; this do ye as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me."

From what has been said concerning the words in which the Lord's Supper was instituted, and the occasion on which it was established, the conclusion seems inevitable, that in its design it is simply a memorial, and that in its form it was founded on some practices observed by the Jews, though not required by their law, in eating the passover.

As Jesus may have seen fit, however, in the communications which he made to the apostles after his resurrection, to institute some alteration in the nature of this ordinance, it becomes necessary to examine their writings, in order to ascertain whether any such change was really appointed. We find, on turning to these writings, that the apostle Paul has devoted a considerable portion of his first Epistle to the Corinthians, to some remarks and instructions concerning the Lord's Supper.* But we do not find, in any of these passages, the least intimation of a change in its nature or design. The writer offers some very just reflections and injunctions with regard to the proper observance of the rite; but the account which he gives of its institution coincides, with the exception of a few additions which do not in the least affect its design, with the accounts which are given by the Evangelists. He informs us, as they do, that Jesus commanded his disciples to observe it as a memorial. The simple words of our

* Parts of the tenth and eleventh chapters.

Saviour, "This do ye in remembrance of me," are repeated in this epistle; with respect to the design of the ordinance, nothing more is said.

To excite serious and useful thoughts, therefore, on all that Christ has done for us, particularly in his sufferings and death, by partaking of bread and wine as symbols of his body which was broken and his blood which was shed for us, is the true nature and intention of the Lord's Supper. This is all which the Scriptures teach us with regard to it; it is all which is necessary to answer the purposes of a religious rite; and it is in perfect harmony with a pure and spiritual religion.

And yet how far have men wandered from this original design, and how entirely have they lost sight of its scriptural simplicity! They have never, indeed, produced a single passage from the sacred writings, to warrant the idea that this rite is any thing more than a memorial; but by interpreting a few words literally, which common sense and the common use of language required to be understood figuratively, they have completely buried it under a mass of superstitions, and converted a simple memorial into a terrible mystery. It will be seen that I allude particularly to the *doctrine of transubstantiation;* a doctrine, which I do not hesitate to say stands the very first in point of absurdity among all the corruptions of our religion; a doctrine, which really borrows something like greatness from the very violence of its irrationality, and the proud rank which it takes on the list of superstitions. Among all the wild fables of heathen mythology, all the adventures and metamorphoses of heroes and gods, all the exploits of enchanters, wonders of magic, and mysteries

of witchcraft, there is nothing to equal it; there is not one imagination among them all, which can pretend to vie with it, or which so daringly contradicts every principle of reason, and all the experience of the senses.

To those, who, after the example of the ancient father, delight in exercising their faith on impossibilities, the above representation cannot be unpalatable; and none who are acquainted with the doctrine of transubstantiation, can accuse me of doing it injustice. That doctrine may be fairly stated thus. The elements to be used in the Communion, which before consecration are truly bread and wine, are changed by the act of consecration, the one into the body and the other into the blood of Christ; nothing remaining of the bread and wine but their outward appearance. Under the form of the bread is the whole person and divinity of Jesus; and he is also entirely present under the form of the wine. But in breaking the bread, or drinking the wine, Christ is never divided; as he is wholly present under the form of each particle of the bread and each portion of the wine. He is in this manner really and wholly present in every part of the world, where the Eucharist may be celebrated, though it may be celebrated in ten thousand places at the same time; and he is not the less present at all times in heaven. I have not done; by direct inference from the doctrine of the trinity, each particle of the bread, and each drop of the wine, is the Almighty Being who governs the universe.

Such is the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. I will not say that the members of that church are not sincere in their belief of it. I will only say, that human ingenuity might strive in vain to

form a doctrine more fruitful in contradictions; and that to require a belief in it seems to me not only to demand an entire surrender of reason, but to lead to utter infidelity—for I would much sooner believe that my eyes were deluded, when I supposed they were perusing a book called the Bible, than that a hundred substances, which my sight, my touch, my taste, and my smell told me were bits of bread, were each the God who created me.*

As this doctrine is throughout an argument against itself, it will only be necessary to offer a few remarks on the words of Scripture, which are adduced to support it. The words of our Saviour, in the distribution of the bread and wine, were, "This is my body," and

* The celebrated Chillingworth heaps together a number of the contradictions immediately resulting from the doctrine of transubstantiation. "Sixthly," he says, "I desire you to vindicate from contradiction these following assertions; that there should be length and nothing long, breadth and nothing broad, thickness and nothing thick, whiteness and nothing white, roundness and nothing round, weight and nothing heavy, sweetness and nothing sweet, moisture and nothing moist, fluidness and nothing flowing, many actions and no agent, many passions and no patient; that is, that there should be a long, broad, thick, white, round, heavy, sweet, moist, flowing, active, passive, nothing! That bread should be turned into the substance of Christ, and yet not any thing of the bread become any thing of Christ; neither the matter nor the form, nor the accidents of the bread, be made either the matter, or form, or the accidents of Christ. That bread should be turned into nothing, and at the same time, with the same action, turned into Christ, and yet Christ should not be nothing. That the same thing, at the same time, should have its just dimensions, and just distance of its parts one from another, and at the same time not have it, but all its parts together in one and the self same point. That the body of Christ, which is much greater, should be contained wholly and in its full dimensions without any alteration in that which is lesser, and that not once only, but as *many times* over as there are several points in the bread and

"This is my blood." It is contended that these expressions are to be interpreted literally. Why they should be thus interpreted, it is hard to see. In the institution of the Jewish rite which has just now been noticed, it is said, *This is the Lord's Passover;* but it has never been asserted, I believe, that the paschal lamb was Jehovah in the act of passing over the houses of the Israelites. And yet the rule of literal interpretation requires such a meaning. Again; we must make thorough work in this kind of interpretation. If we believe that the bread in the communion is the body of Christ, we must also believe, that it was so at the time of the first celebration; and that it was not only his body, but his crucified body, for Jesus said, "This

wine. That the same thing, at the same time, should be wholly above itself, and wholly below itself, within itself, and without itself, on the right hand, and on the left hand, and round about itself. That the same thing, at the same time, should move to and from itself, and lie still; or that it should be carried from one place to another through the middle space, and yet not move. That it should be brought from heaven to earth, and yet not come out of heaven, nor be at all in any of the middle spaces between heaven and earth. That to be one should be to be undivided from itself, and yet that one and the same thing should be divided from itself. That a thing may be, and yet be nowhere. That a finite thing may be in all places at once. That a body may be in a place, and have there its dimensions, and colour, and all other qualities, and yet that it is not in the power of God to make it visible and tangible there, nor capable of doing or suffering any thing. That there should be no certainty in our senses, and yet that we should know something certainly, and yet know nothing but by our senses." After enumerating several other contradictions, he adds, "All these, and many others of the like nature, are the unavoidable, and most of them the acknowledged consequences of your doctrine of transubstantiation, as it is explained one way or other by your Schoolmen." *The Religion of Protestants a safe way to Salvation,* chap. iv. sec. 46.

is my body which *is* broken for you." Is it probable that the twelve disciples regarded the bread which they ate as the mangled body of their Master, while they saw him living and unhurt before them?

The simple truth is, that in the whole compass of language, there is not a more common figure than that which authorizes us to say, such a thing *is* such another thing, when we mean that it *represents* the other thing.

The doctrine of Luther on this subject, is not in the least degree better than that of the Catholics. He taught that the real body and blood of Christ were united with real bread and wine in the Sacrament; and he called this doctrine *consubstantiation*. The great reformer did nothing by this change, but deprive himself of the advantage of the words of Scripture. Jesus certainly did not say, "This is my body *united with bread*," and "This is my blood *united with wine*."

Leaving these perversions, let us return to the plain and scriptural account of the Lord's Supper. The bread and wine of the Communion are symbols of the body and blood of Christ; and we partake of them in remembrance of him.

With this view of the nature and design of the rite, I shall proceed to consider its efficacy and obligation.

Obituary of the Rev. Mr. Christie.

Died on the twenty-first of November, 1823, at Long Branch, New Jersey, the residence of his son-*in-law*, Mr. William Renshaw, late of Philadelphia,

the Rev. William Christie, in the seventy-fourth year of his age.

Mr. Christie was a native of Scotland, and came with his family to this country about twenty-eight years ago. He was in early life engaged in business, but relinquished it in consequence of his devotedness to literary pursuits. Being a strict unitarian, he instituted a society for unitarian worship, at Montrose in Scotland, in the year 1782, and continued statedly to officiate in it for several years, until his removal to Glasgow; so that he may be considered as the *earliest unitarian minister in Scotland.* The discourses which he delivered at Montrose on the organization of the society, were published in a duodecimo volume, and are entitled, "Discourses on the Divine Unity;" this publication passed through several editions, being esteemed in Great Britain inferior to no work on the same subject that has since appeared from the press. (The writer of this article is not acquainted with any volume which is equally systematic and complete.) After his removal to the United States, Mr. Christie was principally occupied as a classical instructer, but of late years his declining strength rendered him unequal to the task of superintending a school.

Besides the work already mentioned, he published "Sixteen Dissertations on the Divine Unity;" a work of considerable merit, but which, probably from the obscurity of its author, and the peculiar phraseology of its title page, has not been much called for. He also published several poems and other small pieces; a speech delivered at the interment of Dr. Priestley, and a review of the doctor's theological works.

Few men have possessed the talent of expressing themselves with greater clearness and strength of language, than Mr. Christie; and what was not a little remarkable, his memory did not appear to be impaired in his latter years. It was faithful even as regarded the most minute particulars. No man could be more inflexible in his adherence to what he deemed the cause of truth, and to the principles of integrity, as applicable to the duties of social life. It was much to be lamented, that his habits were so much those of a recluse; but it was easily to be perceived by those who knew him, that he was by no means wanting in many of the best qualities of the heart. His manners, by their peculiarity, seemed to unfit him for social intercourse; and he appeared to desire privacy rather than a free commerce with society; yet when engaged in conversation, it was at once pleasant and improving to listen to him.

A christian from principle and conviction, he was in the habit of acknowledging God in all his ways, and of referring all his concerns to the Divine disposal; thus, notwithstanding many severe trials and reverses, he always maintained that the ways of heaven were just, and wise, and good. His strength, for a considerable time, had been declining, but his last illness was only of two days' continuance; during which he was often heard to speak in the most grateful terms of the kindness of his relatives, and to implore on them, and on their young family, the choicest blessings of the Father of mercies. He might, therefore, be said to have died in the exercise of benevolent feelings,

and in the expression of devotional language;—a suitable preparation for the society of the just made perfect, and the regions of peace and love.

J. T.

New Work proposed by Rammohun Roy.

In reading the preface to Rammohun Roy's *Final Appeal to the Christian Public*, our attention was powerfully arrested by the following proposal for a monthly theological publication.

"As Christianity is happily not a subject resting on vague metaphysical speculations, but is founded upon the authority of books written in languages, which are understood and explained according to known and standing rules, I therefore propose, with a view to the more speedy and certain attainment of religious truth, to establish a monthly periodical publication, commencing from the month of April next, to be devoted to Biblical criticism, and to subject unitarian as well as trinitarian doctrines to the test of fair argument, if those of the latter persuasion will consent thus to submit the scriptural grounds on which their tenets concerning the Trinity are built.

"For the sake of method and convenience, I propose that, beginning with the Book of Genesis, and taking all the passages in that portion of Scripture, which are thought to countenance the doctrine of the Trinity, we should examine them one by one, and publish our observations upon them; and that next month we proceed in the same manner with the Book of Exodus, and so on with all the Books of the Old and New Testaments, in their regular order.

Few men have possessed the talent of expressing themselves with greater clearness and strength of language, than Mr. Christie; and what was not a little remarkable, his memory did not appear to be impaired in his latter years. It was faithful even as regarded the most minute particulars. No man could be more inflexible in his adherence to what he deemed the cause of truth, and to the principles of integrity, as applicable to the duties of social life. It was much to be lamented, that his habits were so much those of a recluse; but it was easily to be perceived by those who knew him, that he was by no means wanting in many of the best qualities of the heart. His manners, by their peculiarity, seemed to unfit him for social intercourse; and he appeared to desire privacy rather than a free commerce with society; yet when engaged in conversation, it was at once pleasant and improving to listen to him.

A christian from principle and conviction, he was in the habit of acknowledging God in all his ways, and of referring all his concerns to the Divine disposal; thus, notwithstanding many severe trials and reverses, he always maintained that the ways of heaven were just, and wise, and good. His strength, for a considerable time, had been declining, but his last illness was only of two days' continuance; during which he was often heard to speak in the most grateful terms of the kindness of his relatives, and to implore on them, and on their young family, the choicest blessings of the Father of mercies. He might, therefore, be said to have died in the exercise of benevolent feelings,

and in the expression of devotional language;—a suitable preparation for the society of the just made perfect, and the regions of peace and love.

J. T.

New Work proposed by Rammohun Roy.

In reading the preface to Rammohun Roy's *Final Appeal to the Christian Public*, our attention was powerfully arrested by the following proposal for a monthly theological publication.

"As Christianity is happily not a subject resting on vague metaphysical speculations, but is founded upon the authority of books written in languages, which are understood and explained according to known and standing rules, I therefore propose, with a view to the more speedy and certain attainment of religious truth, to establish a monthly periodical publication, commencing from the month of April next, to be devoted to Biblical criticism, and to subject unitarian as well as trinitarian doctrines to the test of fair argument, if those of the latter persuasion will consent thus to submit the scriptural grounds on which their tenets concerning the Trinity are built.

"For the sake of method and convenience, I propose that, beginning with the Book of Genesis, and taking all the passages in that portion of Scripture, which are thought to countenance the doctrine of the Trinity, we should examine them one by one, and publish our observations upon them; and that next month we proceed in the same manner with the Book of Exodus, and so on with all the Books of the Old and New Testaments, in their regular order.

"If any one of the Missionary Gentlemen, for himself and in behalf of his fellow labourers, choose to profit by the opportunity thus afforded them of defending and diffusing the doctrines they have undertaken to preach, I request that an Essay on the Book of Genesis of the kind above intimated may be sent me by the middle of the month, and if confined within reasonable limits not exceeding a dozen or sixteen pages, I hereby engage to cause it to be printed and circulated at my own charge, should the Missionary Gentlemen refuse to bestow any part of the funds, intended for the spread of Christianity, towards this object; and also that a reply (not exceeding the same number of pages) to the arguments adduced, shall be published along with it by the beginning of the ensuing month. That this new mode of controversy by short monthly publications may be attended with all the advantages which I, in common with other searchers after truth, expect, and of which it is capable, it will be absolutely necessary that nothing be introduced of a personal nature, or calculated to hurt the feelings of individuals—that we avoid all offensive expressions and such arguments as have no immediate connexion with the subject, and can only serve to retard the progress of discovery; and that we never allow ourselves for a moment to forget that we are engaged in a solemn religious disputation."

Whether this work will ever be commenced and prosecuted, we know not. There will doubtless be many obstacles to it; some of them arising unexpectedly, and some purposely created by interested men. But it is enough to increase our former admiration of *this* wonderful Hindoo, that he has simply announced

such an undertaking. A periodical publication, devoted to the *exegesis*, as Professor Stuart would call it, of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, to be carried on by a Bramin of Hindostan, in the English language, at his own expense, with his own types, and at a press which is worked by his own countrymen! Who would have ventured to predict such a thing twenty years ago?

It has been for some time one of our most pleasing contemplations to mark the path of this man. It is a track of light in a dark sky. We cannot despair of the conversion of British India, at no very distant period, to a pure system of religion and morals, while we behold such a man as Rammohun Roy, labouring with all his heart and all his means in the cause of reason and knowledge and truth.

Installation at Brooklyn.

On Wednesday, the fifth of November, the Rev. Samuel Joseph May was installed Pastor of the First Church and Society in Brooklyn, Connecticut. Introductory prayer by Rev. Mr. Wilson, of Petersham; sermon by Rev. Mr. Walker, of Charlestown, (from 1 Corinthians, i. 23, 24;) consecrating prayer by Rev. Dr. Bancroft, of Worcester; charge by Rev. Dr. Freeman, of Boston; right hand of fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Peabody of Springfield; address to the people, by Rev. Dr. Thayer, of Lancaster; concluding prayer, by Rev. Mr. Parkman, of Boston.

This installation is an encouraging sign of the times. It announces to the friends of gospel freedom, that

liberal principles of religion, and liberal views of Christianity, have at length gained a footing in Connecticut. The spirit of exclusiveness is passing away, the glory of *consociations* is on the wane, and we trust that it will wax no more. The people are beginning to resist the usurpations of a narrow-minded clergy, and to disregard the pretensions which have so long been made, and so long been admitted, to the exercise of an unhallowed authority over mind, and faith, and conscience. We devoutly hope, that the congregation at Brooklyn is not the only one in that state, which has determined to incur the disgrace no longer, of bowing down their souls in slavish submission to the men who have placed themselves on the spiritual judgment seat, and dared to arrogate a power over those thoughts and determinations of the human mind, which God alone can rightly discern, and which God alone will righteously judge. We hope to hear no more of ministers being haled before an ecclesiastical court, for studying the Bible, to discover its true meaning; or of their being torn from their parishes, for declaring the result of their honest convictions. We hope that the monstrous inconsistency will no longer exist, of a protestant people in a free land, submitting to a clerical dominion as despotic as that of Rome in the dark ages.

The gentleman who is now installed over the first church in Brooklyn, we are sure will labour effectually in sowing the seeds of an enlighted faith, and spreading abroad in his neighbourhood the simple and unalloyed truths of christianity.

THE

UNITARIAN MISCELLANY

AND

CHRISTIAN MONITOR.

No. XXXVII.] JANUARY, 1824. [Vol. V.

Doctrine of Two Natures in Christ.

In our last number we attempted a slight historical notice of the doctrine of the union of two natures in Jesus Christ, and expressed our intention to consider, in a future number, some of the most important objections to this hypothesis. We shall now proceed to state these objections, after observing, in order to prevent being misunderstood, that we fully admit the divinity of our Lord's character and mission. That he was the "Son of God," that he always acted and spoke with divine authority, is not doubted. Nothing we are about to offer is *inconsistent* with the supposition, that he holds the most exalted rank among finite intelligences, that he is superior to all other beings who possess only a derived existence, and inferior only to Him who "inhabits eternity," and fills the throne of the universe. We hope that we feel as deeply impressed with the excellences of his character, and the importance of what he has done for us, as any of our brethren who entertain different views of his person. All we attempt to show is, that there is no foundation for

the trinitarian distinction of two natures in him. We contend only for his unity. We maintain that he is strictly one—one person, one mind—in opposition to the doctrine which assigns him a double nature, supposes him to have two minds, an infinite and a finite, and thus, we think, introduces strange confusion into our conceptions of his character, and lamentably mars the simplicity of the sacred writings.

Our principal objections to the orthodox distinction of two natures in Jesus Christ are, that it involves an absurdity; that it destroys the personal unity of Jesus Christ; that it exposes him to the charge of equivocation and dishonesty; that it introduces the utmost confusion and uncertainty into the sacred writings; that it is unnecessary; that it receives no support from the scriptures; and that it is attended with difficulties, far greater than those which it professes to remove.

1. We think that the doctrine of two natures in Jesus Christ, as held by its advocates, is absurd, and consequently that no evidence whatever would be sufficient to establish it. Before we believe it, we must entirely abandon the use of our understandings; we must free ourselves from a disposition to weigh evidence; we must have that convenient pliancy of mind, that happy facility of belief, to which the good father had attained, when he said, "I believe, because it is impossible."

If we reflect for a moment on the qualities of the divine and human natures, we must, one would think, be convinced, that they can never be united in the same mind or person. They are absolutely incompatible with each other; they cannot possibly exist together in the same intelligent agent. What are the attri-

butes of the divine and human natures? God is infinite, everlasting, immutable, omnipotent, omniscient, and infallible. Man is finite, limited in knowledge and power, weak, erring, subject to vicissitude, disease, and death. Now, let any one, who ventures to use his understanding, say whether these qualities are compatible with each other. For ourselves, we think they are such, that their union in the same being is naturally impossible. It is the union of infinite and finite, of knowledge and ignorance, of power and weakness, of perfection and imperfection. We may as well talk of the union of light and darkness, or of any two qualities, of which the one necessarily implies the negation or absence of the other.

What is the consequence of the union of divine and human attributes in the same mind or being, on the supposition, admitted by our adversaries, that the two natures remain distinct, none of the qualities of either being lost or changed? Why, that a being may be at the same time infinite and finite; that he may be omnipotent, yet partake of weakness and infirmity, and be unable of himself to do all things; that he may be omniscient, yet be ignorant of many things; that he may be the Father of the universe, yet a wailing infant, wrapped in swaddling clothes, and lying in a manger; a being incapable of pain and suffering, yet a man of sorrows, who expired on the cross, was placed in a shroud, and slept in the tomb. Now if this be not downright contradiction and shocking absurdity, we confess we know not what contradiction and absurdity are.

We do not think our opponents very fortunate in their attempts to illustrate the doctrine of two natures

in Jesus Christ by comparison. Thus we are told, that for an explanation of it we must look into ourselves, and consider the union of soul and body in man; "for as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ." Such is the language of the Athanasian creed. The comparison it suggests has been a favourite one with the advocates for the theological doctrine of the incarnation, from the time this doctrine came to be received to the present day. That such has been the fact, we think a remarkable instance of the effect of hereditary prejudices in blinding the understanding, and of the lamentable weakness of human nature, which induces men to listen to the most flimsy argument and shallow sophistry, when employed in the support of received opinions.

The comparison of the two natures of Jesus Christ, with the union of spirit and body in ourselves, may serve to introduce confusion and darkness into a person's ideas, in consequence of which he may lose sight of the absurdity of the hypothesis, which it is meant to illustrate;—perhaps he may think, that he has, at length, hit upon a parallel, which solves all difficulties. But a little sober reflection, we think, must abate his confidence. To us the two cases appear totally dissimilar. Man is a complex being, very different from that compound being, which Christ is represented by our adversaries to be. If you admit the common distinction, and say that man is made up of matter and spirit, and then inquire what is his nature, the only general and intelligible answer to this inquiry is, that it is those properties, corporeal and mental, which result from his constitution and physical organization; that is, all those qualities, which

constitute him what in his present state he is. Now it cannot be said, that any of these qualities are incompatible with others. There is nothing in any of them, which makes it a contradiction or absurdity to suppose, that they may all exist together in the same subject. You may, indeed, affirm of a part, what is not true of the whole of man. You may say of his body, that it has extension and solidity, and attribute to his mind perception, memory, judgment; but here is no contradiction. You do not attribute to him, as an individual or whole, opposite qualities. You do not ascribe to his person qualities or acts so utterly repugnant, that one necessarily excludes the other, as light excludes darkness, or omnipotence, weakness. Our objection to the union of two natures in the person of Jesus Christ, is, that it brings together an assemblage of qualities, which are incompatible with each other; that it ascribes to Christ, as an individual or person, properties, between which there is such an utter repugnance, such direct opposition, that they cannot exist together in the same subject. Our opponents affirm, that Christ is perfect God and perfect man; consequently he must have all the qualities of both, as omnipotence and weakness, infallibility and fallibility, infinite knowledge and limited and partial information; and these qualities are affirmed of him in a personal character. Man presents no phenomenon resembling this; no such monstrous combination of incongruous and opposite qualities.

With regard to the apparently contradictory language, which is sometimes employed in speaking of man, and the fallacy of supposing, that it resembles, in the least, that which the doctrine of two natures

authorizes us to use in speaking of Christ, we can add nothing more to the purpose, than the following extract from one of the best writers and profoundest theologians of our country. Alluding to propositions, such as those we employ, when we "affirm of man, that he is mortal, and that he is immortal; or of a particular individual that he is dead, and that he is living, (meaning by the latter term that he is existing in the world of spirits,)" he observes, "the last mentioned propositions belong to a very numerous class, comprehending all those in which the same term is at once affirmed and denied of the same subject, *the term being used in different senses;* or in which terms apparently opposite, are both affirmed of the same subject, *the terms being used in senses not really opposed to each other.* When I say that man is mortal, I mean that his present life will terminate; when I say that he is immortal, I mean that his existence will not terminate. I use the words in senses not opposed, and bring together no ideas, which are incompatible with each other. The second proposition, just mentioned, is of the same character with the first, and admits, as every one will perceive, of a similar explanation. In order to constitute any analogy between propositions of this sort, and those before stated, [such as are involved in the doctrine of the union of the divine and human natures in Christ,] our opponents must say, that, when they affirm that Christ is finite and not finite, omniscient and not omniscient, they mean to use the words finite and omniscient in different senses in the two parts of each proposition. But this they will

not say; nor do the words admit of more than one sense."*

2. We object, in the second place, to the doctrine of two natures in Jesus Christ, as held by trinitarians, that it destroys his personal unity; that it makes him two distinct persons, two beings. It is not necessary for us here to go into the metaphysical inquiry, in what personality consists. Our common apprehensions are sufficient to guide us. Every one knows well enough what he means, when he uses the term person, though he may not perhaps be able to give a definition of it, that would be received by a metaphysician or philosopher. A person is an intelligent agent; he has one will and one consciousness; he has perceptions and feelings, which he may properly call his own. But according to the hypothesis of our adversaries, Christ has two distinct wills, and two minds; the one infinitely superior to the human, having distinct properties, views and perceptions, having, in fact, nothing in common with human nature; the other, human, having a will, perceptions, and feelings exclusively its own. This surely makes Christ two persons, if we understand any thing about personality—and two as far removed from each other as infinite is from finite. God is an intelligent agent; the human mind of Christ another intelligent agent; each nature, we are told, retains its proper attributes,—"the essential properties of one are not imparted to the other." How it is possible to escape the conclusion, that here are two intelligent agents, two persons, we acknowledge we are unable to conjecture. It is really matter of astonish-

* Professor Norton's "Statement of Reasons."

ment to us, that any one, who reflects at all on the subject, does not perceive the insuperable difficulties, which the hypothesis of two natures presents, with regard to the personal unity of Jesus Christ.

Trinitarians do not hesitate to ascribe to each of the two supposed natures of Jesus Christ qualities strictly personal. They sometimes speak of him as having the essential attributes of God—as performing what God alone can perform; at other times, they describe him as having the perceptions, and all the sinless failings and infirmities of man; as being tempted and exposed to suffering as we are. It appears surprising, that they do not perceive that in doing this, they make him two beings as distinct from each other, as any two of their fellow mortals are, and as remote as God is from man.

3. Our next objection to the doctrine of two natures in Christ, as maintained by our opponents, is, that it exposes him to the charge of equivocation and dishonesty. We are told, that our Saviour sometimes acted and spoke in his human, and sometimes in his divine nature; thus, when he said, that he could of himself do nothing, he meant, that as man he could do nothing, although as God he could do all things; when he declared, that he knew not the day and hour of judgment, we are to understand by this declaration, that he was ignorant of it as man, although he knew it perfectly well as God. We hope we shall not appear guilty of irreverence, when we observe, that this is precisely what in a fellow mortal we should call, by the mildest term, equivocation. It is inconsistent with that openness and integrity which we expect from each other. When one affirms that he does not know *a thing*, he means, if he is an honest man, that he does

not know it in any way whatever. It is vain for him to allege, that he knows it only in a certain character, that he is ignorant of it as man; as if a priest should declare, that he is ignorant of a fact as man, though he knows it as confessor; or a person should affirm, that as a corporeal being, he is ignorant of what as an intelligent or spiritual being he knows well enough. This will not save him from the charge of equivocation or falsehood. Let us beware of ascribing to Christ conduct which would be thought disingenuous or immoral in a fellow mortal. If he did not deceive, if he made the ordinary use of language, he could not declare, that he was ignorant of what he knew, in any manner whatever. It is a wretched subterfuge to say, that he was ignorant of it in his human, though he knew it in his divine nature. No matter in what way he knew it; if he knew it in either nature, he knew it in a personal capacity, his person including both natures; that is, he knew it in an absolute sense; and could not then, without subjecting himself to the charge of insincerity, declare his ignorance of it. Would his disciples, or those who heard him, suspect him of any reservation, or of using equivocal language? Would they not suppose, that when he told them he did not know or could not do a thing, his words were to be understood in their ordinary sense? If they were used in any uncommon sense, which he took no care to point out, how can he be defended from the charge of having made a deceitful use of language?

We think, that no person of unperverted mind and feelings can read the history of Jesus without becoming impressed with the idea, that ingenuousness, truth, sincerity, and openness, are among the most remarka-

ble traits, by which he was characterized. This alone would make us very reluctant in believing, that he would, on any occasion, have employed expressions, which have the appearance only of the least approach to equivocation and dishonesty.

4. Further, we think that the doctrine of two natures in Jesus Christ, as influencing the laws of interpretation, throws the utmost darkness and obscurity over the sacred writings. We consider it a plain fact, that the Bible is to be interpreted in precisely the same way with other ancient writings. We are to ascertain the sense of it by the same process we employ to ascertain the sense of any work, which we attempt to read. On any other supposition it is perfectly unintelligible; and the fact, that it was unintelligible, would force us to conclude, at once, that it had no claims to a divine character. If God condescends, by messengers and prophets, to instruct men on subjects connected with their most important interests, we may be certain, that he will cause the information which he thinks fit to communicate, to be conveyed through a medium capable of being understood; that is, the messengers he employs must use language in the ordinary way; they must observe those established laws and usages from which no writer, who wishes to be understood, on whatever subject he treats, ventures to depart. We cannot suppose, that he would so far sport with his creatures, as to present the instruction he professes to impart, in a form which would render it useless, by preventing it from being understood.—We complain of the doctrine of the two natures, as explained by its advocates, that it leaves us in the utmost doubt about the sense of the sacred writings; that

makes the New Testament a book wholly unlike all thers; that it renders it necessary for us to judge of ıe meaning of it, therefore, as we judge of that of no ther book ancient or modern. The consequence is, ve can never be certain, that we understand the facts r observations recorded by the historians of our Lord. The impressions which we receive concerning the most mportant of them, may be entirely erroneous. It is ot pretended, that our Lord on any occasion intimated ı which of his two capacities, the divine or human, he poke or acted. He no where observes, this I say as ıan, or this I say as God. He has not thrown out the east hint, by which we may be guided in determining vhat is to be ascribed to one nature, and what to the ther. Nor is this deficiency supplied by the histoians of his life. They have left on record nothing by vhich we may be assisted in deciding in which nature ıe at any time spoke or acted. How then, upon the ıypothesis of our adversaries, is the language, in vhich he is spoken of in the New Testament, to be ınderstood? It appears to us that the hope of ever urriving at any thing like certainty concerning the import of it, must be abandoned, we do not say by the plain and illiterate, but by the profoundest masters. A more than oracular obscurity hangs over the sacred pages. The book which professes to convey instruction in characters so distinct, that "he who runs may read," becomes filled with difficulties, which serve only to perplex and bewilder our minds.

We do not, upon mature reflection, perceive in what manner the above mentioned objection can be obviated, without abandoning the doctrine of two natures. We know it is *said*, that we must determine whether

Christ's human or divine nature is referred to by what is affirmed of it, according to the maxim of the schools, "*the subject is known by its predicate.*"* Thus with regard to the assertions, "my Father is greater than I," "I can of my own self do nothing," "of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father only," and those in which Jesus is described as praying to the Father, being exalted, and receiving from him a name above every name, and others of a similar character, we are told that they refer to Christ not in a personal capacity, but in one of his natures only, that is, his human. But in what manner this strange inference is authorized by the maxim alluded to, we confess ourselves unable to discover. It appears to us to be founded on a total disregard of the plain and obvious force of expressions in themselves quite simple and intelligible. If language is capable of a definite sense, and we know any thing about the laws of reasoning, the legitimate inference to be drawn from the above mentioned assertions is, that Jesus is inferior to the Father, not as to a part, but the whole, of his nature; that is, he is so in an absolute unqualified sense. There is nothing in what is affirmed concerning him, which necessarily requires the subject to be taken in a restrained sense; nothing in the nature of the expressions employed, which limits them to a part of this subject. These expressions, in their most obvious sense, are not repugnant to reason, nor, we think, to the general train of facts and arguments found in the Scriptures, and do not therefore require to be restricted.

* Professor Stuart's Fourth Letter.

To restrain them by supposing, that they are appropriated only to one part of Christ's nature, that they are not true when affirmed of him absolutely or generally, is really to put on them a construction altogether unnecessary and manifestly forced.

5. We observe, in the next place, that the hypothesis of two natures in the person of Jesus Christ is not needed; that the object for which it is employed may be obtained without it. Its advocates consider it important, as furnishing a solution of some difficulties arising from the apparently discordant language used by the sacred writers in speaking of Christ. There appears to us no occasion for an hypothesis of this kind to solve these difficulties. The greater part, if not all of them, may be fully removed by an application of those rules of criticism, which we think ourselves authorized to apply in the explanation of all other writings.

Our views on the subject of the necessity of this hypothesis, as affecting apparent discrepancies in the language of the New Testament, may be stated in few words. We consider the fact, that Jesus Christ is a being distinct from the Father, and inferior to him, completely established by the general strain of the New Testament. We think that this fact is directly asserted in a large number of passages. At the same time we admit, that there is a class of passages capable of receiving a construction, which favours the supposition of our opponents with regard to the divinity of his nature; but they do not, we conceive, necessarily require this construction; they admit of being understood differently, without appearing to be forced from their natural sense. We think that without de-

parting from the established laws of criticism, we are able to explain them in a manner consistent with the views which we are led, from the general tenor of the language of the New Testament, to form of the Saviour. We conceive, that nothing is there said of him, which may not be said of a being inferior in his whole nature to God. Language occurs there, which is sometimes figurative, and sometimes partakes of the nature of rhetorical description; it is partly loose and popular, and requires, therefore, to be restrained and modified; and partly the language of feeling and sentiment, which is necessarily somewhat indefinite. It is not surprising, that some of this language should at first view occasion embarrassment, and that some expressions are met with, which admit of being understood in different senses. It would be strange if they conveyed the same sentiment, or shades of sentiment, to all minds. We are persuaded, however, that they are capable of receiving a construction, which is in unison with our views of the person and rank of the Saviour, and therefore think the hypothesis of two natures entirely unnecessary. We have no occasion to resort to it, to obviate any difficulties which the language of the New Testament presents.

It is sufficient barely to allude to another advantage, with which the doctrine of a divine nature in Christ is supposed to be attended. It is sometimes said, that sin, being committed against an infinite being, is an infinite evil, and deserves infinite punishment; that none but an infinite being is therefore capable of making atonement for it. This reasoning has in it so much palpable absurdity and bare-faced sophistry, that we may well be surprised it should ever be employed, or for a

moment listened to. In the first place, nothing can be more absurd than to suppose, that sin, because committed against an infinite being, is an infinite offence. No act of a finite being can have a character of infinity. But throwing out of view this and similar considerations, which might be added, it is absolutely false that any infinite atonement has been made, even upon the hypothesis of our adversaries. Would trinitarians be understood to say, that the supreme and infinite God, the great Author and Preserver of nature, really suffered and died on the cross? that an omnipotent Being was put to death by sinful children of dust? that the Creator perished by the hands of his creatures? that the world was left three days, during which Jesus lay in the grave, without a God, that the universe stood without a Preserver? No. The bare supposition of such an event, if it were possible, would, in the highest degree, shock our feelings. On the hypothesis then that Christ was God as well as man, he suffered only in his human nature. No infinite nature suffered. What then becomes of the infinite atonement? No such atonement has ever been made, even admitting that Christ united in himself the divine and human natures. On this supposition, it was man only that endured the cross; so that with regard to the doctrine of the atonement, the belief in the deity of Jesus has not the least advantage over the belief in his simple humanity.

One further difficulty with regard to the death of Christ, suggests itself, upon the hypothesis of our adversaries. They are compelled to disown the conclusion, that the divine nature suffered; yet the divine and human natures, it is asserted, were indissolubly united in the person of the sufferer; and we are told

expressly by Dr. Barrow, that "the union did not cease, even when our Lord as man did undergo death"—that this union "persisted" when that "between human soul and body was dissolved." Here certainly appears to be occasion for some very nice distinctions—distinctions, we are afraid, much too refined for common minds. To a man of plain understanding it must appear somewhat paradoxical to say, that one of two natures indissolubly united in the same person, may with this person undergo death, while the other does not partake of suffering. It would seem that the union must be dissolved at death. But this is inadmissible upon the hypothesis of trinitarians. The union is indissoluble. We leave our adversaries to get rid of the consequences.

Some other advantages are occasionally described as following from the union of two natures in Christ, which we do not deem of sufficient importance to be noticed.

6. We object further, that the doctrine of two natures in Christ receives no support from the Scriptures. It is not alleged by the advocates of the doctrine, that it is any where expressly stated in the sacred writings, in the form in which it is received by them. It is admitted, that nothing is directly said of the union of the divine and human natures in the person of Jesus Christ. It is entirely a matter of inference, that such a union exists. This we consider very unfortunate for the hypothesis. It throws no small degree of suspicion over it. It might have been expected, that a doctrine of so extraordinary a nature would have been stated in the most plain and explicit language. One would have supposed, that it would

have been a topic, on which our Lord would have been careful to have instructed his disciples in the fullest manner. This would seem necessary, in order to prevent misconception or doubt, on a subject confessedly obscure, and surrounded with numerous difficulties. When we reflect on this circumstance, and consider, that not a single passage occurs in the whole New Testament, which contains any thing like a direct allusion to the doctrine of two natures as admitted by Trinitarians, the omission appears very extraordinary. We say more, it seems utterly incapable of being accounted for. The doctrine, if true, is certainly an important one, and of a nature, it might be thought, which required that it should be taught with the greatest distinctness. Why then this silence upon the subject, on the part of our Saviour and his apostles? Why is it, that no direct trace, no incidental notice of it, is found in any expressions, which dropped from their lips? Why are we left to find it out by a laboured process of reasoning? It surely affords very strong presumption against the doctrine, that nothing approaching to a direct statement of it occurs in any part of the New Testament.

There is another consideration, which has great weight with us. It may be fairly concluded, that those, who were about the person of our Lord, or who were occasionally addressed by him, had no suspicion that he was God, from the circumstance, that they give no evidence of having felt that astonishment, which the disclosure of such a fact could not have failed to excite in their breasts. Had they regarded him as the supreme God, is it possible, that upon first becoming acquainted with the fact, they would have betrayed no

surprise? That he was in appearance a man is not doubted; as such he was presented to their senses. What then must have been their astonishment, upon hearing that he, who stood before them in the human form, was the Father of the universe! Yet nothing of this astonishment appears to have been felt by them. It is indeed more than once said, that those about him were astonished at his mighty works; and the inference they made was, that he was *of* or *from* God;—the idea that he was God himself, seems never to have occurred to their minds. No curiosity was expressed, and no inquiries made, of such a kind as might have been expected, had they had any suspicion, that he was perfect God as well as perfect man. The inference is, that they were ignorant that such a union existed. It is an argument of some force against this union, that those with whom Jesus conversed familiarly, during the whole term of his public ministry, appear not to have had the least knowledge or suspicion of it.

7. If the objections stated in the foregoing pages have any force, the doctrine of two natures in Jesus Christ is attended with difficulties, we do not hesitate to say, far more embarrassing than those it professes to remove. Admitting the latter to be as great as they appear to the advocates of the doctrine under consideration, they amount, we conceive, to this, and to nothing more—that apparently discordant expressions are occasionally found in the Scriptures, which this doctrine reduces into harmony with each other—that the sacred writers in speaking of Christ, use language, which appears consistent only on the supposition, that he possessed both a divine and a human nature. To remove apparent discrepancies an hypothesis

is employed, which, according to the view we have of it, mars the simplicity and darkens the sense of the sacred writings; subjects our Saviour to the charge of dishonesty or falsehood; and involves an impossibility and absurdity. No hypothesis can be attended with more inconveniencies than this. Whatever difficulties we escape, we fall into greater, by adopting it. But we have stated, that in our view, no formidable difficulties arise from the forms of language alluded to; and that all alleged discrepancies disappear, when the expressions, which are supposed to imply them, are understood in the sense they manifestly bear. We see not the least necessity, then, for the supposition of two natures in Christ, even were the difficulties attending it fewer than they are. We lament to add, that by adopting it without any necessity, we assume an hypothesis, which unsupported as it appears by the Scriptures, and followed by consequences the most absurd and appalling, disgraces religion, and dishonours the human understanding.

Nor let it be imagined, that any thing is lost by abandoning this doctrine. Jesus remains an object of our sincerest, and, under God, our profoundest gratitude and regard. We can have no doubt of his sufficiency for the purpose which he was sent to accomplish; our confidence in him as a deliverer, who is able to save to the utmost, is not diminished; our hopes of pardon through him are not impaired or shaken. God raised him up and employed him to convey the benefits of his mercy to mankind. On that mercy we rest, believing, that through whatever medium our Father may have chosen to impart it, that medium must be effec-

tual, and that mercy shared by us, unless by a fault of ourselves.

On the other hand, by abandoning the doctrine of two natures, as stated by trinitarians, we escape important difficulties. We are freed from numerous embarrassments, into which an attempt to explain and defend it unavoidably plunges its advocates; the language of the sacred writings appears simple and intelligible; no seeming shade is thrown over the character of our Saviour; he is presented to our view robed in that sincerity, truth and ingenuousness, which make him venerable and lovely.

Such are our views and feelings on this important subject.—We have endeavoured to express them plainly; we hope we have done it without any seeming want of candour, and without offence. We know that what we have advanced will meet the disapprobation of great numbers of our fellow-christians. We expect not their sympathy. All we ask of them is indulgence, if we have betrayed a faulty tone of feeling; and particularly, if in the warmth of argument any expressions have been allowed to escape us, which may be thought to savour of harshness towards those from whom it is our fortune to differ. A. L.

A New Year's Wish.

From Fawcett's Sermons.

I CONCLUDE, with heartily wishing, that the year you have entered upon, may prove a happy one to you all. I cheerfully concur with the customary salutations, which, at this season, you are all receiving, in

other places, from the mouth of all you meet, by wishing you a happy new year, in that way, which is most suitable to this place, and most consistent with my profession; which is by wishing you the wisdom to improve it well; words, which, though they carry a graver sound to your ear, express precisely the same sentiment, that is contained in the complimental blessing, by which you are saluted in the gay and festive circle.

I wish to the young, the good understanding to make choice of what shall cheer them most in the days of their youth, that gladness, which only God can put into the heart of man; that joy, which is kindled by the light of his countenance; that generous festivity, whose most sumptuous fare is surrounding happiness; and that gay conscience, which will give fresh spirit to the pulse of health, new gold to the sunshine of nature, and additional delight to their most delightful days! At the call of cheerful piety and sincere goodness, and to that potent call alone obedient, happiness, my young candidates for her, shall come down, and accompany you through the whole course of all your successive years; that happiness, which, at the commencement of each of them, the lip of civility invokes to descend upon you, but which only the voice of virtue within you can prevail to bring down to you. Virtue is a friend, and the only one that has power to accomplish the periodical benedictions, which other friends can only pronounce, and put you into actual possession of all the happiness, which the warmest of them can wish you.

And, while I beg my young auditors to permit me to express my friendship for them, at this season of kind and friendly greetings, by praying that they may enter

upon that virtuous practice, which contains the answer to the prayers for their happiness their other friends express in other words, let the imperfectly virtuous, let the best before me, allow me to wish for them, a perpetual progress from one degree of animation to another, in that spirit of goodness, which includes all the spirit of happiness.

And let them who have slept till to day in the lap of moral sloth, and continued in a state of total insensibility to this virtuous and happy spirit, accept my sincere wishes for their immediate excitation to the proper employment of their powers. Let their resolution to rouse themselves bear the date of this day. Let them make it memorable to themselves, for their recovery from the sleep of moral indolence; from the lethargy of their best energies; from the swoon of their highest faculties. Let them mark it in their calendar, as the day, upon which they awoke to duty and to God; upon which they were born to the noblest life; the natal day of peace, and hope, and joy! when first their reason saw the light of wisdom, and their bosoms were open to admit the sunshine of the breast! Let them distinguish this day, by a determination to dedicate every succeeding day to their duties. Then, as often as they shall throw their eye over the annual record of written time, they shall smile upon the note that is made of it in the number of the months; they shall rejoice to see it "joined unto the days of the years;" and think it deserving of a redder letter than the rest. Then, to them, as long they live, in a far higher degree, and a far sublimer sense, than any in which they yet have spent it as such,

> "The yearly course, that brings this day about,
> Shall never find it but a holiday!"

A Story—from Sadi.

Translated from Hammer's History of Persian Letters.

A NIGHTINGALE built his nest on a branch, beneath ıich a poor ant had for some days established his nt. Day and night the nightingale fluttered round e rosebush, and poured out his song in tones which vished the heart. The ant day and night was busy; ıt the nightingale in fields and gardens delighted himlf with his own melodies. He prattled affectionately ith the rose of his loves, and grew familiar with the ind of spring. The weak ant, as he marked the flatrings of the rose and the entreaty of the nightingale, ıid to himself, what may come hereafter of all this ıattering?

Now when the fine season of the year was gone by, nd the autumn wind rode along, thorns stept into the lace of the roses, and ravens usurped the haunts of ıe nightingales. The hurricanes of autumn swept nwards, and robbed the trees of their ornaments. The leaves grew sear, and the air blew cold. From he clouds there dropt pearls, and in the air flew the amphor of snow.

Just then the nightingale suddenly entered the garlen, in which there was no more the hue of roses, nor he perfume of jessamines. His tongue, versed in a housand traditions, grew mute. There was no rose, ıt which he could gaze; no green, of which he could contemplate the beauty. In the leafless grove his courage sank; and in the general stillness each tone died in his throat. He remembered, that in former days an ant had lived near his tree, and had gathered

many kernels. I will go to him to-day, thought he, and for good neighbourhood's sake I will beg something of him.

So the nightingale went, naked and hungry, to the door of the ant, and said, Generosity is a proof of thy fortune, and the capital of my welfare. I have squandered precious life heedlessly; but thou hast been industrious, and hast gathered provision. What will come of it, if thou shouldst rescue me to-day from misfortune?—The ant spake; Thou didst pass the night in singing of love, and I in active labour. Thou wast now busy with the blossom of roses, and now proud at the regards of spring. Knewest thou not, that spring is followed by autumn, and that every road leads through deserts?

Friends, apply the story of the nightingale to your own condition; and know, that upon all life death follows; and after every enjoyment comes division. The draught of life is not without dregs; and the satin of existence has creases.

"Two went up into the Temple to Pray."

By Richard Crashaw.

Two went to *pray!* O rather say,
One went to *brag*, th' other to *pray*.

One stands up close, and treads on high,
Where th' other dares not lend his eye.

One nearer to God's altar trod,
The other to the altar's God.

Religion the Friend of Mental Improvement.

There cannot be a greater mistake than to suppose that the Scriptures speak unfavourably of human learning, and that religion looks with a cold or an angry eye on the efforts of the mind to cultivate and improve its powers.

False religion, indeed, will uphold ignorance, because ignorance is her best auxiliary and friend. Error can only be revered in darkness, and would therefore shut out with all possible care the beams of wisdom, lest they should shine in upon her deformity, and dispel the delusion of her worshippers. But pure religion seeks for knowledge as her companion; and truth rejoices in the light.

The passages which have been adduced from Scripture to prove that religion and human learning are opposed to each other, have in such instances been altogether misunderstood. Whenever the wisdom of man is spoken of with disparagement, it is either when it is compared with the omniscience of God, or when that vain, purblind wisdom is meant, which presumes to question the ways of Providence, and to unsettle the foundations of piety and virtue. With regard to passages of the first description, no pious man, of any sect or church, will think of comparing the knowledge of mortals, in its utmost extent, with the eternal and unsearchable wisdom of Him who knows all things. And that other wisdom which questions the justice and rectitude of Heaven, or employs itself in disseminating bad principles, in putting darkness for light, and light for darkness, what is it, but the extreme of folly and

madness? Who will say that it should not be denounced?

Instead, however, of depreciating real and valuable knowledge, the Scriptures are full of exhortations to the attainment of it. They tell us that it is better to get wisdom than gold; that the heart that hath understanding seeketh knowledge; and that fools hate knowledge. They tell us that Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians; and that because Solomon chose wisdom rather than riches or power, the Almighty rewarded him with those other endowments beside. Where is the source of all knowledge, but in the Deity himself; and for what were the Scriptures given us, but to communicate instruction?

It may be regarded, indeed, as one evidence of the divine origin of the Scriptures, that in every part they rise superior to the condition of the ages in which they were composed, and point forward to an improved state of society. Though in many respects adapted, as it was necessary they should be, to the mental advancement of the people for whose immediate use they were written, there yet may be discerned in them throughout a lofty and enlarged strain of sentiment and anticipation, which the world could not have received because it could not comprehend it. Each prophet seems to stand on a sunny eminence, and while altars are smoking, and victims are bleeding, and gorgeous vestments are glancing, and the shouts and hymns of the prostrate crowd sound like the murmur of a distant ocean, beneath him, to fix his gifted eye on a bright and calm and far off spot, and contemplate soothing visions of purity, simplicity, knowledge and truth.

What more interesting and appropriate relations has learning, than those which she forms with religion? When does the conviction of God's omnipotence and majesty fall so irresistibly on the soul, as when she is borne by science up among the stars, and sees each separate light a mighty and a breathing world, self suspended in illimitable space, preserving its own appointed bounds, and obeying with exactness the unuttered laws of its invisible Director. To what better conclusion can we arrive, when we observe, in the animal kingdom, each creature fitted by its construction, its habits, and its instincts, for its respective element or climate, for defence against its enemies, and for procuring its proper food—to what better conclusion, I say, can we arrive, than that God the Creator is wise and merciful, and confines not the means of happiness, and the joy of living, to one part of his earth, or one class of his subjects, but scatters them with no stinted hand through every region of existence; whether it be under the burning line, the temperate zones, or the icy circles of the north and south; whether in the thin air, or the deep sea? And what more consoling reflection can we derive from our investigations into the laws and order of the universe, than that He who upholds all other things will not be wanting in his care for ourselves?

Let us instance again in that sublime revelation of Christianity, the doctrine of a future life. If, out of all the animating conclusions which we draw from this faith, there is one more animating than another, it is, that the immortal mind will hereafter range through wider fields of knowledge, than those which limit its researches now; and that its faculties will expand with

increasing luxuriance through heaven's eternal spring. We rejoice in believing that we shall be endued with capacities of discerning things which here are impenetrably concealed from us, and with powers of improvement which will raise us continually higher in the creation of God.

The connexion too which exists between human knowledge and human happiness, is proof in itself that mental cultivation cannot be hostile to the dictates of religion; for the design of religion is to advance the well-being and true enjoyment of mankind. Now I will not say, that knowledge is always happiness; but I believe that I can with safety say, that knowledge may always be made conducive to happiness, if we take the proper means of bringing about so desirable a result. It depends on the dispositions and habits of our minds, and the application which we make of our advantages and acquisitions, whether knowledge is in any case to prove our bane, or whether it is to be a source of perpetual blessing. We hear it said, for instance, that such a man is raised by his talents and attainments above the condition of those around him, that he cannot participate in their feelings, prejudices, resentments, partialities, pleasures, interests or pursuits, and that therefore he is a solitary being, who has cut himself off from the blest communion of human fellowship. But is not this his own fault? Why does he withdraw himself from the circle of his kindred? Where has he learned to slight the sympathies of even the least cultivated individuals of his race? What science has told him that simple minds have no mysteries, and simple hearts no gentle visitings? Can he despise the affections of the human breast, however

rude may be the words in which they are clothed? Can he refuse to take an interest in those cares and duties, which, though humble, occupy the existence and constitute the probation of his fellow mortals? Then, with all his wisdom, he is but half learned. He has not learned the value of his own nature. He does not know, that "man's heart is a holy thing." It does not follow, by any means, that because a man reads much, and thinks profoundly, and feels keenly, and is gifted with a bright and creative fancy, it does not follow, that he should be thrown out of the region, and the reach of human sympathies. The truly wise man will estimate and cherish them; and then the stores of his mind will be sources of added enjoyment, and his wisdom will not prove his sorrow.

So it is with the knowledge of the evil that is in the world. Though it may be perverted to harden the heart and blunt the moral sensibilities of its possessor, yet it may also be made to increase his happiness. If he has formed for himself correct principles of action, and is thoroughly convinced that virtue is the greatest good, he will not, on the one hand, be corrupted by bad influences, and on the other, his knowledge of the forms and ways of vice will enable him to guard himself more effectually from its power, than if he were ignorant of its devices.

Examples might be multiplied; but the considerations already advanced will abundantly justify the conclusion, that instead of discouraging, religion commends and stimulates mental exertion, and is friendly to the cause of intellectual improvement. We are called on, therefore, as we regard the dignity of our nature, the interests of virtue, our own happiness, and

the happiness of our fellow-beings, to push our researches after knowledge to the utmost, and to use every means in our power to communicate instruction, to enlighten the uninformed, and spread abroad the mandates of reason and truth. We must not heed the cry of prejudice, we must not fear the threats of bigotry, and we must not listen to the selfish whispers of a short sighted policy; because it is our sacred duty to go on with ardor, confidence and resolution, in maintaining, as ably as we may, the claims and rights of the human mind.

Liberty of the Press.

In looking back a few centuries on the progress which has been made in almost every department of knowledge, we cannot but perceive how much of it has been effected by the art of printing. This great invention, by multiplying copies of works with an almost magic facility, and at an expense, which, when compared with the prices paid in former times for manuscripts, appears as nothing, has not only increased to an incalculable degree the number of professed students and lovers of literature, but has communicated the benefits of instruction to all classes and conditions of men. It has led forth learning from the ancient places of her seclusion, the academy, the cloister, and the dark grove, and has introduced her to the gay, the busy, and the poor; so that she now walks abroad in the streets and the highways, and over the fields, and converses freely with men in crowded marts, in splen-

did courts, in hostile camps, and by the cheerful fireside. Books are no longer the exclusive luxuries of the wealthy; they are no longer only to be met with chained to the dusty shelves of a monastic library, or clasped and hung to the girdles of churchmen; they lie on cottage window-seats, they are in the cabins of our ships, and in the tents of our soldiery, they are the familiar companions of the female sex, and they are scattered among the playthings of children. Wisdom is no longer the torch of the Grecian game, passed down from separate hand to hand; it may rather be compared to the sacred fire, kindled, as travellers tell us, on the birth day of our Saviour in the Church of the Sepulchre at Jerusalem, which is no sooner exposed to view, than the whole mass of devotees rush on to illumine their tapers at its flame, and in an instant a thousand lights are glancing through the temple.

The press has, in short, sent forth such vast quantities of writings into the world, that it may be doubted whether any cause of destruction could obliterate these labours of the mind, which would not also exterminate the human race. Towards the accomplishment of such an object, a second Omar could effect nothing.

Its power is of course immense, both for good and for evil. It disseminates opinions of all kinds on every subject, and administers poison, as well as healthy nutriment. It is not surprising, therefore, that attempts should often have been made to restrain its liberty, and limit its power, not only by those interested persons who have feared that it would deprive them of unrighteous authority, but by the sincerely virtuous who have dreaded its corrupting effects on the morals of society.

The Church of Rome began very early to prohibit the reading of certain books, and about the year 1550 published a list of them, called an Index Expurgatorius, which has since been enlarged as occasion required. Even in protestant countries, overseers have been appointed by law, to peruse all writings intended for the public, and with authority to license or suppress, as they should think proper. Such a body of licensers existed, and exercised their powers in England, till a little more than a century ago, when it was abolished by act of parliament. At present, although any person in that kingdom may print what he pleases, he is liable to punishment if the book is found to contain sentiments which the law pronounces to be pernicious.

I shall offer, as briefly as possible, a few considerations, to show that no restraint whatever should be imposed on the freedom of the press, but that it should be left unquestioned and entire.

With regard to those countries in which it has been shackled the most, it will be necessary to say but a few words. Their example is proof sufficient, that the effect of literary despotism is ignorance and degradation. Their inhabitants are sunk in deep superstition; and when they talk of liberty, they hardly understand the meaning of the word. The illiterate believe any thing and every thing; a great part of the higher orders believe nothing; and the remainder do not know what to believe. All writings of a bold and manly character are withheld from the people; and it has been said that there is hardly a good work of morality or devotion, which has not been prohibited by the Roman *Index*.

Nor has the licensing system, as it has been pursued in more free and enlightened parts of the world, any thing to recommend it. The licensers are men, with the prejudices, interests and passions of men, and will never be wholly impartial in their judgment. They may be very wise men, and very good men, but will not certainly be infallible. They will have their systems and their theories, on government and morals and religion, and will hardly grant an *imprimatur* to that author who writes against their party, or their church. And yet the author may be right, and they themselves wrong. They will be continually committing mistakes, and some of their mistakes will be of vital importance. With the best intentions possible, they may and must often misconceive the forms of fundamental truth. "If it come to prohibiting," says that great man, one only of whose praises it is that he wrote Paradise Lost, "If it come to prohibiting, there is not aught more likely to be prohibited than truth itself; whose first appearance to our eyes, bleared and dimmed with prejudice and custom, is more unsightly and unplausible than many errors; even as the person is of many a great man slight and contemptible to see to." And when truth is acknowledged and permitted to pass, is it not humbled and disgraced by the permission? Can it not walk forth freely without asking leave, and going in leading strings, and wearing a mark and a collar, like a slave or a dog?

And now let us consider the mildest restraint which has been attempted on the liberty of the press, by punishing the authors or venders of pernicious books, and ask what good it has done? Let us reflect a little on some characteristics of human nature, and we shall see

what harm it will do. Will it not be the invariable consequence of inflicting punishment on the publishers of bad books, that general attention will be excited to those books, and an uncommon desire be entertained to purchase and read them? And will not human ingenuity find out ways enough, in spite of all obstacles, to print and to sell them? And when they are read under these excitements, will not the impression which they make on the mind be far greater than in ordinary cases, and will not their mischievous effects be doubled? There is no doubt of it. The sympathy and curiosity produced by a judicial condemnation, will both increase the numbers of the obnoxious work, and induce people to read with interest what they would otherwise have soon thrown by in weariness or disgust. This is no theory, no unfounded speculation. It is established by facts which have recently occurred in England. To mention no others, there is the case of the bookseller Carlisle. He printed and published some of Paine's infidelity. Half of the trash would have grown yellow on his shelves, if the arm of authority had not troubled it. He was prosecuted, condemned, fined and imprisoned. And what was the consequence? Carlisle was regarded as a persecuted man, and Paine became a popular author. The book rose into sudden demand; one of the imprisoned publisher's family took up the profitable business of selling it; means were found of eluding the vigilance of the law; and low and ignorant people taught themselves to question the genuineness of the Scriptures, and ridicule and abuse the religion of Christ. Mark the difference between the effects of this and the opposite method of procedure. In the country where the publisher of

Paine's works was fined and imprisoned, those works can be purchased in any quantities, and with ease; but here, in our own country, where no man would be meddled with for publishing them, there is scarcely a copy to be found; nobody feels any desire to read them, and it is therefore no one's interest to keep them for sale.

When we come to speak of the character of such works, we are on another subject entirely. They are worthy of the utmost abhorrence. I look on the man who so far degrades himself, and perverts the powers which God has given him, as to send forth a work of impiety, immorality, or obscenity to the world, as one of the worst of criminals, as one of the sorest plagues that can infest society. But I am sure that the evil will not be cured, but rather increased, by punishment and coercion.

If it be inquired, how is the evil to be counteracted? I answer, by the remedies of truth, reason, and argument. If the pernicious treatise be popular, let a popular treatise oppose it; if it pretend to be learned, let learning be enlisted on the other side. Is error so subtle that it cannot be refuted? Is virtue so foolish or so indolent, that she cannot or will not defend herself and her votaries? Is licentiousness so bold and successful that she cannot be shamed? Then shame on the virtuous, and shame on the pious, and shame on the learned; if their principles, and their zeal, and their education, and their scholarship, amount to nothing more than this, why, shame on it all! But it is not so; there are able champions in the cause of faith and righteousness, and they have conquered, and they will go on to conquer, and with them will fight all the

what harm it will do. Will it not be the invariable consequence of inflicting punishment on the publishers of bad books, that general attention will be excited to those books, and an uncommon desire be entertained to purchase and read them? And will not human ingenuity find out ways enough, in spite of all obstacles, to print and to sell them? And when they are read under these excitements, will not the impression which they make on the mind be far greater than in ordinary cases, and will not their mischievous effects be doubled? There is no doubt of it. The sympathy and curiosity produced by a judicial condemnation, will both increase the numbers of the obnoxious work, and induce people to read with interest what they would otherwise have soon thrown by in weariness or disgust. This is no theory, no unfounded speculation. It is established by facts which have recently occurred in England. To mention no others, there is the case of the bookseller Carlisle. He printed and published some of Paine's infidelity. Half of the trash would have grown yellow on his shelves, if the arm of authority had not troubled it. He was prosecuted, condemned, fined and imprisoned. And what was the consequence? Carlisle was regarded as a persecuted man, and Paine became a popular author. The book rose into sudden demand; one of the imprisoned publisher's family took up the profitable business of selling it; means were found of eluding the vigilance of the law; and low and ignorant people taught themselves to question the genuineness of the Scriptures, and ridicule and abuse the religion of Christ. Mark the difference between the effects of this and the opposite method of procedure. In the country where the publisher of

Paine's works was fined and imprisoned, those works can be purchased in any quantities, and with ease; but here, in our own country, where no man would be meddled with for publishing them, there is scarcely a copy to be found; nobody feels any desire to read them, and it is therefore no one's interest to keep them for sale.

When we come to speak of the character of such works, we are on another subject entirely. They are worthy of the utmost abhorrence. I look on the man who so far degrades himself, and perverts the powers which God has given him, as to send forth a work of impiety, immorality, or obscenity to the world, as one of the worst of criminals, as one of the sorest plagues that can infest society. But I am sure that the evil will not be cured, but rather increased, by punishment and coercion.

If it be inquired, how is the evil to be counteracted? I answer, by the remedies of truth, reason, and argument. If the pernicious treatise be popular, let a popular treatise oppose it; if it pretend to be learned, let learning be enlisted on the other side. Is error so subtle that it cannot be refuted? Is virtue so foolish or so indolent, that she cannot or will not defend herself and her votaries? Is licentiousness so bold and successful that she cannot be shamed? Then shame on the virtuous, and shame on the pious, and shame on the learned; if their principles, and their zeal, and their education, and their scholarship, amount to nothing more than this, why, shame on it all! But it is not so; there are able champions in the cause of faith and righteousness, and they have conquered, and they will go on to conquer, and with them will fight all the

honourable feelings, and high aspirations, and holy thoughts of man, all the pure and endearing relations of society and of home, and order, justice, decency, hope and gratitude.

With regard to speculative inquiries, there are very few which I would even attempt to discourage by angry disapprobation. Many a truth do we discover, only by the examination of many falsehoods. To prove that one system is tenable, it is often necessary to show that others which have been offered are groundless; just as some theorems of Euclid are established, by reducing to an absurdity every position which contradicts them. The seeker after truth, like the hero of a fairy tale, is often obliged to pass through successive scenes of deception, and encounter numerous shadowy dangers and temptations, before he can arrive at the inner apartment of the castle, and dissolve the enchantment.

There are few theories, too, which do not contain much that is profitable to be known; for they who have the ingenuity to advance them, will generally say something useful, if it be only for their own refuting. In their very wanderings they will point out beacons and landmarks, which will denote with increased accuracy the pleasant country and the safe road. "If the men be erroneous who appear to be the leading schismatics," says Milton again, "what withholds us but our sloth, our self will, and distrust in the right cause, that we do not give them gentle meetings and gentle dismissions; that we debate not, and examine the matter thoroughly, with liberal and frequent audience; if not for their sakes, yet for our own? Seeing no man who hath tasted learning, but will confess the

many ways of profiting by those, who, not contented with stale receipts, are able to manage and set forth new positions to the world. And were they but as the dust and cinders of our feet, so long as in that notion they may yet serve to polish and brighten the armory of truth, even for that respect they were not utterly to be cast away."

Let then opinion meet opinion, on all grounds of debate and controversy. Let system combat system, and theory wrestle with theory. Let the press work on with all its activity; throw not over it a single fetter. Who says that truth is powerless, and friendless, and cannot prevail? She must prevail. Away with your fears of heresy and heretics, and your grave talk about latitudinarianism, and disorganizing tenets, and the destruction of faith, and the unhinging of society! Such alarms indicate but a slight estimation of that which should be most valued, and but a poor and doubtful reliance on that which should be most firmly trusted in—TRUTH. Truth will prevail at last—or there is no such thing as truth.

Dr. Murdock's Discourse on the Atonement.

THIS discourse was delivered last August, in the Chapel of the Theological Seminary at Andover, and was soon afterward printed at the request of the students. Its author is Professor of Sacred Rhetoric and Ecclesiastical History in the Seminary. It came before the public therefore with no ordinary claims, and we took it up with no ordinary expectations. We

were disappointed. Notwithstanding the respect which we entertain for Andover Institution and its professors; notwithstanding the approbation with which the discourse was received by the whole body of its students, and the sanction which they have given it by assuming the expense of its publication, we are compelled to pronounce it a very moderate kind of performance. We wonder what they all saw in it, either so acute, so well written, so Calvinistic or so Hopkinsian, as to make them want to print it.

We will try to give some account of the doctrine of this discourse; though it is of so indefinite a nature, that our task will be none of the most easy.

Among the author's first positions on the subject, it is maintained, that though the Scriptures do not enable us perfectly to understand the nature of the atonement, yet "for the attainment of salvation, it may be sufficient that we know and believe firmly the simple fact, *that there is forgiveness with God for the penitent believer, on account of something which Christ has done or suffered.*" This seems to be laying a broad foundation—rather indistinct to be sure—but still so broad, that with a very little explanation we think we might stand on it ourselves. But the professor says, that on a subject of so much importance, more knowledge is desirable—and he says too, that on few points in theology, has the Christian church made greater progress in knowledge; and that there have been continual advances, from the times of the earliest fathers to the present day. This is a precious confession to come from Andover. We thought they had more reverence there for the Assembly's Catechism. But, perhaps, it

is a periodical reverence, which comes round upon them only once in every five years.

The system, which we take for granted is the most modern and improved one, is thus developed. An inquiry is first made into the reasons which induce or require God to inflict punishment on transgressors. These are stated to be three. God punishes wickedness, in the first place, because it is wrong, and because, being infinitely pure himself, he abhors iniquity; in the second place, because the good order and happiness of his kingdom require it; and thirdly, to promote the personal benefit of those who transgress. Neither of these reasons, says the professor, *except perhaps the last*, will God ever cease to regard. To remove the second ground of punishment is the proper business of the atonement. Nothing that a Mediator could do would remove the first and third; which can only be effected by a change of character in the sinner himself. We will now exhibit the next step of the argument, in an extract from the discourse.

"Thus far we have been examining and attempting to ascertain, precisely, the nature of the difficulty which it was the business of the atonement to remove. The difficulty, it appears, consisted wholly in the second ground of punishment; that is, in the necessity of distributive justice to the well-being of the universe.

"To remove this difficulty, or to enable God righteously to pardon the repenting sinner, the atonement must give the same support to law, or must display as impressively the perfect holiness and justice of God, as the execution of the law on transgressors would. It must be something different from the execution of the law itself; because it is to be a substitute for it, something which will render it safe and proper to suspend the regular course of distributive justice.—If such an expedient can be found, then an adequate atonement is possible; otherwise it is not."

After it is settled in this positive manner what is and what is not, we are told that the required expedient is the sacrifice of Christ, which was "an exhibition or proof of the righteousness of God." "The only difficulty" says the author, "is to understand how this exhibition was a display of the righteousness of God." The difficulty is thus solved.

"The atonement was an *exhibition* or *display*. That is, it was a *symbolical transaction*. It was a transaction, in which God and his Son were the actors; and they acted in perfect harmony, though performing different parts in the august drama. The Son in particular, passed voluntarily through various scenes of humiliation and sorrow and suffering; while the Father looked on with all that tenderness and deep concern, which he—and none but he—could feel. The object of both, in this affecting tragedy, was to make an impression on the minds of rational beings every where, and to the end of time. And the impression to be made, was, that God is a holy and righteous God; that while inclined to mercy, he cannot forget the demands of justice, and the danger to his kingdom from the pardon of the guilty; that he must shew his feelings on this subject; and shew them so clearly and fully, that all his rational creatures shall feel that he honours his law while suspending its operation, as much as he would by the execution of it."

The professor seems to be fond of theatrical comparisons. In shewing that it was not the death of Christ alone, but the whole course of his life and ministry, together with his death, which constituted the atonement, he speaks as follows.

"Any and every part of the exhibition, and every circumstance attending it,—every thing that Christ either did or suffered, from the time of his descent from heaven till his return thither,—had an atoning efficacy, so far as it contributed to render the exhibition as a whole more impressive. For the transaction operated as a whole, and was intended to produce one general effect. It is not then to be anatomized, and to have distinct offices assigned to its different members. Doubtless some scenes in that august tragedy, which occupied more than thirty years in the performance, were

more impressive, and of course contributed more to the atonement, than others. The descent of the Son of God and his assumption of our natures, or the first opening scene of the tragedy, was very striking. His entrance on the arduous and benevolent work of a public teacher and a public benefactor, was a sublime scene. Various others, of much interest, followed rapidly. The plot thickened, and the whole assumed a deeper and deeper colouring, till the last awful scene, which displayed the Son of God nailed to a cross, in agony, unpitied, and bowing his head in death."

We think we know now what the Andover scheme of atonement is; and when any inquiry on the subject is made of us, we shall feel authorised to say, that in the intervals between the quinquennial revolutions of the Assembly's Catechism, the doctrine at the Theological Institution is, that the atonement is a tragedy, with regular acts and scenes, and a constantly thickening plot, exhibited before the world, to display the righteousness of God, and thus, somehow or other, to enable him to suspend the regular course of distributive justice; or, to use another expression of professor Murdock's, to give him "an expedient for avoiding a legal procedure in regard to believers." If we are told that this is irreverent trifling, we can only answer that it is not ours; it comes from Andover. We really feel ourselves quite orthodox by the side of such a system.

One word more about the tragedy. Near the beginning of the discourse the author says, "If, with some modern writers, we could believe that the atonement made by Jesus Christ, is, not the meritorious ground of justification, but *merely a tragic scene*, intended to affect us, and bring us to repentance, and if we could discover the necessity and the propriety of so strange a procedure, then, indeed, we might suppose God to have set forth his Son as a kind of propitiatory offer-

ing to men;—and for the purpose of shewing compassion for them." Now, whoever these people are who make the atonement a tragic scene, we think the professor might have shown a little more respect and sympathy for them. Or did he forget that he was going to make it all a tragedy himself? Or is there some great and important distinction between a tragic scene and a tragedy?

We do not intend to argue against this system; because there is no occasion that we should. Our only object was to give a fair account of it; and that we have done. And now we would ask what is it all, that they who profess it should assume such solemn airs, and call their neighbours heretics, and shudder at the very name of Unitarianism? What is there in it? It is a mere shadow. It has neither the good sense of a rational faith, nor the striking and terrible features of the high systems of orthodoxy. All the old schemes of satisfaction and vicarious atonement are given up; and nothing remains but a hollow, weak, senseless theory; which, like some of the illusions of old romance, only needs to be looked at stedfastly, and it will vanish into air. But because its authors and teachers make use of an established set of words and phrases, which fall soothingly on peoples' ears, without communicating a single idea to their minds; and because they stir up *revivals*, and recommend Scott's Bible, and preach in a particular tone, they keep up their credit for orthodoxy, and are supposed to monopolize all the vital religion in the land; while we, who endeavour to understand, and make others understand, Christianity, are shunned as "deists in disguise," *who* profess a system of "refined naturalism," and are

constantly "explaining away the Scriptures." Explaining them away! When they need explanation, we explain them into sense, at any rate; and do not turn the life, doctrine, and death of Christ into a theatrical exhibition, and an expedient to *enable* God to be merciful.

For the present we shall say nothing more of Dr. Murdock's discourse; except that we sincerely recommend it to all Unitarian Tract Societies, as a work which might be published and circulated by them, with great benefit to the unitarian cause.

Third Annual Report of the Baltimore Unitarian Book Society.

The third anniversary of the Baltimore Unitarian Book Society was held in the First Independent Church, on the 25th of December. After the religious exercises, the following Report was read.

REPORT OF THE MANAGERS.

Firmly convinced of the truth of liberal and rational views of Christianity, and of the happy influence which they are calculated to exert, wherever they are sincerely and consistently received, the Managers of the Baltimore Unitarian Book Society have employed themselves to promote its objects, if not to the utmost extent of their ability, yet, they are encouraged to believe, with no inconsiderable zeal and effect.

Their efforts have been animated by the assurance, that a lively curiosity exists in different parts of the

Union with regard to the peculiarities of unitarian belief. Many are anxious to know what that faith is, which has been so much spoken against, that they may examine its pretensions, and judge of its truth for themselves. To answer these calls, a great variety and number of tracts, explaining and defending the leading articles of Unitarianism, have been distributed in the several states of Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Ohio, Kentucky, Illinois, and Indiana.

In the interior of New York and Pennsylvania, this desire for information seems particularly to be manifested, as a more than ordinary demand for tracts has been made from those sections of the country.

As the knowledge of our sentiments has been diffused, the prejudices entertained against them have worn away. The cry of heresy is now fainter than ever. As the extravagant terrors lately expressed have turned out to be vain, they have subsided; and as the serious warnings which have been uttered have proved to be without cause, they are more and more disregarded. Our enemies are now somewhat cautious in denouncing our opinions, because they find that it is more difficult to prove their assertions than to utter them; and that the more our books are vilified, the more they are read. They begin to be taught by experience the justice of a maxim, which has thus been expressed by Lord Bacon, that "a forbidden writing is thought to be a certain spark of truth, that flies up in the faces of those who seek to tread it out."

The progress of Unitarianism in every direction, realizes the expectations of its friends. In this country especially, where there is no establishment to

confer authority on ancient errors, and dignities and wealth on those who uphold them; where there is no imposition of a religious test to exclude the honest and conscientious from public offices; and no worldly splendour shed over an adopted creed to blind the unthinking to its defects and contradictions; in this free country, liberal Christianity is making its most rapid and encouraging advances. Since the last meeting of this Society, several religious congregations have been formed on independent principles, and have dedicated their places of worship to "the Lord our God, who is ONE LORD."

And when we look abroad, we see nothing in the prospect to depress our hopes. Our friends in Great Britain and in various parts of Europe, though labouring under discouragements, from which we, by the blessing of God, are exempted, still continue to exert themselves, and still are rewarded with success.

But there is one spot, in a far distant quarter of the world, to which they who rejoice in the truth look with peculiar pleasure. It is now some years since we received the surprising intelligence, that a native Hindoo had worked his unaided way to a pure and enlightened faith, and was attempting the conversion of his countrymen. Born among idolaters, and educated in the idolatrous system of his ancestors, Rammohum Roy had the firmness to renounce idolatry, and forsake the temples of his paternal gods. Acquainted with Christians only in the persons of trinitarian missionaries; and hearing no expositions of Christianity, but such as those missionaries were accustomed to offer, he became convinced by a serious and thorough investigation of our Scriptures, that they inculcate the

doctrine of the Divine Unity;—with heathenism on the one hand, and trinitarianism on the other, he rose from his studies *a Unitarian Christian.* In inculcating and defending his religious views he has been indefatigable; he has converted one missionary who was sent to convert him; and from time to time he has published works which take a high rank in controversial theology, and which the most learned members of the India mission are unable to refute. Is it not an argument of the most powerful kind against the existence of the trinitarian doctrine in the Christian Scriptures, that the very first heathen of learning and talents who in our times has properly examined them, declares that he cannot find it there? Does it not speak loudly in favour of our views of the Divine Nature, that a man who came to the study of the Bible without the prejudices of early education, without any interested feelings, and with an intimate knowledge of the languages in which the Bible was written, has arrived at the conclusion, that the simple unity of God is inculcated in both Testaments?

It is not, however, we hope, with sectarian feelings that we regard the result of the inquiries of this learned Hindoo. It is not merely because he professes our opinions, that we speak of him with so much satisfaction. But it is because we are convinced that simple, unitarian Christianity is the only Christianity which will ever make a permanent impression on his countrymen; and that he will do more toward advancing the cause of pure religion among them, than all the missionaries in Bengal, and all the converts they have made.

Neither is it in the selfish spirit of proselytism that we would labour to spread our opinions at home. We do not disperse our books and tracts with the object of swelling our list of nominal converts. We desire no converts, but those who become so with the fair assent of their reason and conscience. We do not want to have our sentiments adopted by any, who are not thoroughly persuaded of their truth and their value. We tell no one that the rejection of our creed will cost him his salvation. We have no idea that it will. We believe that every person who leads a holy life, is a subject of the gracious regards and glorious promises of God; and we have the authority of God's word for believing so. We utter no threats; we issue no excommunications; and we despise cant.—One great motive of our efforts is the conviction we entertain, that by inculcating a rational faith, we increase the security of piety and virtue, and by offering men a system of religion, which can be defended on the grounds of justice and common sense, we furnish them with answers to the loose and profane, and guard those whose opinions are unsettled, from being ridiculed out of all religion and all principle.

The Managers beg leave to state, that though it has not been deemed expedient to publish any tracts during the past year, they have made many exchanges with other societies and with individuals, and that they now have at their disposal a greater variety of books and tracts, than at the beginning of the year. They would also take this opportunity of gratefully acknowledging the receipt of several valuable donations of books; one particularly from the Rev. Mr. Sparks, of a large number of copies of his "Inquiry into the comparative

Moral Tendency of Trinitarian and Unitarian Doctrines."

By order of the Managers,
HENRY PAYSON, President.

The officers and managers for the ensuing year are the following;

HENRY PAYSON, *President.*
WILLIAM G. APPLETON, *Secretary.*
ISAAC PHILLIPS, jr. *Treasurer.*
WILLIAM C. SHAW, *Librarian.*

REV. F. W. P. GREENWOOD,
WILLIAM E. MAYHEW,
JOHN W. OSGOOD,
DR. E. PERKINS,
JOHN H. POOR,
WILLIAM DALL,
OSMOND C. TIFFANY,
WILLIAM PENNIMAN.

Ordination at New Bedford.

THE Rev. ORVILLE DEWEY was ordained to the pastoral care of the First Congregational Society in New Bedford, on Wednesday the 17th of November last. Introductory Prayer, by Rev. Mr. Goodwin of Sandwich; Sermon by Rev. Mr. Tuckerman of Chelsea; Consecrating Prayer, by Rev. Mr. Ripley of Waltham; Charge, by Rev. Mr. Kendall of Plymouth; Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. May of Brooklyn, Con. and Concluding Prayer by Rev. Mr. Swift of Nantucket.

THE

UNITARIAN MISCELLANY

AND

CHRISTIAN MONITOR.

No. XXXVIII.] FEBRUARY, 1824. [Vol. V.

The Thirty-nine Articles of Unitarianism.

We are willing to do every thing to please our opponents, short of renouncing the exercise of our intellectual faculties, and disobeying the dictates of conscience. We have at various times endeavoured to satisfy all objections, and answer all charges, against our modes of belief, and our interpretations of the Scripture. When denounced for the shortness of our creed, we have appealed to apostolical authority and example, as recorded in the book of Acts. When extremely candid and well-informed persons have pretended not to know what we believe, we have drawn up abstracts—we have turned down the leaves at one thousand texts in the Bible—we have indeed forever held forth the whole genuine Bible itself—we have manufactured unitarian creeds, catechisms, statements, and summaries, to such a degree, as sometimes to offend the more scrupulous friends of liberty of thought among our own denomination, and to incur the retorted, but very unfair charge of inconsistency, from our foes. Yet still it is one of the

favorite sneers of the great body of the uncharitable, that the constituent feature of Unitarianism is a *negation of belief.* Let us not cease to rebut this injurious accusation, by denials, and proofs, and counter-statements, until it is completely laid aside.

To contribute somewhat to this effect, we have thought that the prejudices of one large class of our opposing fellow-christians might be innocently consulted, by drawing up a list of exactly *thirty-nine* Articles, for which our good name shall be responsible, as comprehending the general faith of Unitarians.

For ourselves we explicitly declare, that we have no great attachment to the exact number of thirty-nine. Indeed we should rather choose a different number, since the above mentioned quantity seems to imply, by a tacit but malicious reference to the "stripes" of olden time, that the imposition of articles of subscription is a kind of punishment or flagellation of the church. Yet as our Episcopalian brethren consider the glory and stability of their communion, as inseparably connected by some mystic charm with the thirty-nine articles, we are certain of finding favour in their sight, by the exhibition of a catalogue of similar numerical magnitude. We shall also, with the view of still further conciliating the same class of christians, adhere as closely as possible to the very order of subjects, and the very cast of phraseology, in which the articles of the English church are constructed. In consequence of this unexceptionable arrangement, it will be perceived by any one, who takes the trouble of comparing the two lists together, that about one half of the Unitarian form is borrowed word for word from its legalized predecessor. We are confident that nothing will now

be wanting to recommend our Procrustean summary to the orthodox, except the authority of an act of Parliament, which in our country, we trust, could have but little weight.

Should we succeed in attracting the sympathy and approbation of our Episcopalian brethren, perhaps we may take the opportunity to secure the charity of our Presbyterian friends, in offering them something in the shape of a Unitarian Westminster Assembly's confession of faith.

But let us assume solemnity of thought and feeling, while approaching themes, that have been abused indeed, but which we would never dare to handle, without suitable reverence and awe.

ART. I. OF FAITH IN THE UNITY OF GOD.

There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the Maker and Preserver of all things, both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead, *there is but one person*, of one substance, power and eternity, the Father;—*and it is utterly impossible that there should be any more.*

ART. II. OF THE WORD OR SON OF GOD.

The *Word of God* is an oriental and highly expressive figure, representing *the power and wisdom of the Deity in the very act of their exertion*; so that it was from everlasting *with the Father;* but was as far from being a separate person from him, as the power, wisdom, authority and verbal commands of an earthly monarch are a person separate from *him;* insomuch that St. John, in the first verse of his gospel, cautions us against such an erroneous idea, by carefully assuring us that

the word was not a different object of contemplation from God himself. The word was with God, but the word was *God.* And since this *power and wisdom* were poured out without measure on Jesus Christ, and were so largely exhibited by him to the world, at the introduction of his religion on earth, he is rightly called, though very rarely in Scripture, by a happy figure of speech, the *Word of God.* This power and wisdom of the Deity were implanted in man's nature in the womb of the blessed virgin, of her substance, so that those *attributes* of the Godhead were joined together with manhood in one person, never to be divided, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile, not his Father to us, but us to his Father, and was made a sacrifice, in the cause of combatting the guilt and sins of men. His appellation *Son of God* was given to him, either on account of his miraculous birth, or, as St. Paul asserts, on account of his resurrection from the dead, or it was a title of eminence long appropriated to the expected Messiah, or, it signified, according to the Hebrew idiom, the close, peculiar, miraculous, and intimate *union and connexion* of Jesus with the Father, or perhaps it was given him on all these accounts together, as they are perfectly consistent with each other, and may all be defended with Scripture.

ART. III. OF THE GOING DOWN OF CHRIST INTO HELL.

[Since the liberty is granted to Episcopalians by their spiritual guides, to reject the article under this title, and since that liberty is very generally seized, *we* surely shall not be condemned for following the *example*. We will, however, substitute a more scrip-

tural article in its place, to preserve our series from the chasm which would otherwise ensue.]

As Christ died for us, and was buried, so also is it to be believed, that he lay until the third day in the tomb.

ART. IV. OF THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.*

Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature; wherewith he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth, until he return to judge all men, at the last day.

ART. V. OF THE HOLY GHOST.

The Holy Ghost is a most significant term, to express conveniently in one word all those miraculous interpositions and influences, *separately from the particular instrumentality of Jesus on earth*, which God exerted in the early establishment of the gospel, and has exerted and will exert in its propagation and extension through all past and future time. It is carefully to be observed, that they who deny the personality of the Holy Ghost do not deny the reality of the operations for which it is the name, so that a horrible clamour has been raised against that, which, at the worst, is only the shadow of an error.

ART. VI. OF THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES FOR SALVATION.†

Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor

* This article is copied entire from the Episcopal Prayer Book.

† This article is copied from the Prayer book; though to save room, the enumeration of the canonical and apocryphal books is omitted.

may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the Holy Scripture, we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, of whose authority was never any doubt in the church.

ART. VII. OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for in the Old Testament, everlasting life is offered to mankind, as it is by Christ in the New, who is the only Mediator between God and man. "Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign, that the Old Fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the law given from God, by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the civil precepts thereof ought, of necessity, to be received in any commonwealth, yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments, which are called moral." Bishop Warburton denies the former part of this article, in which, perhaps, he is joined by some unitarians.

ART. VIII. OF THE CREEDS.

The creed which the Apostle Philip exacted of the eunuch, and many parts of the Apostles' creed, so called, ought thoroughly to be received and believed; for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.

ART. IX. OF ORIGINAL OR BIRTH SIN.

Man is born the subject of a great variety of passions, the due balance of which is essential to his happiness and perfection, but which too frequently become *liable* to an unhappy and sinful excess.

ART. X. OF FREE-WILL.

The condition of man is such, that he *can* turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling upon God; wherefore, we *have* power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable unto God, though the grace of God, as proclaimed by Christ, may often inspire us with a good will, and work with us, when we have that good will.

ART. XI. OF THE JUSTIFICATION OF MEN.

We are accounted righteous before God, if our characters are moulded by the legitimate influences of faith in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Wherefore, in this point of view, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely expressed in the Holy Scriptures.

ART. XII. OF GOOD WORKS.*

Albeit that good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment, yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out, necessarily, of a true and lively faith; insomuch that, by them, a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree discerned by the fruit.

ART. XIII. OF WORKS BEFORE JUSTIFICATION.

Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of the Spirit, are not so likely to be pleasant to God, as those which spring from faith in Jesus Christ; since it is impossible that any motives of action can be so high, pure, and effectual, as those which are suggested to us by the influence of the gospel.

* Copied entire from the Prayer book.

ART. XIV. OF WORKS OF SUPEREROGATION.*

Voluntary works, besides, over and above God's commandments, which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught, without arrogancy and impiety. For, by them, men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake, than, of bounden duty, is required; whereas, Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

ART. XV. OF CHRIST ALONE WITHOUT SIN.†

Christ, in the truth of our nature, was made like unto us, in all things, (sin only excepted) from which he was clearly void, both in his flesh, and in his spirit. He came to be a lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of himself, once made, should take away the sins of the world; *or, as some understand this expression, who, by the exertions in which he fell a sacrifice, furnished the means of removing the sins of the world;* and sin, as St. John saith, was not in him. But all we the rest (although baptized, and born again in Christ) yet offend in many things; and, if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

ART. XVI. OF SIN AFTER BAPTISM.‡

Not every deadly sin, willingly committed after baptism, is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin, after baptism. After

* Copied entire from the Prayer book.

† Copied entire from the Prayer book, with the addition of the lines in Italics.

‡ Copied entire from the Prayer book.

we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and, by the grace of God, we may arise again, and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned, which say, they can no more sin, as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

ART. XVII. OF PREDESTINATION AND ELECTION.

Predestination (if we may dare to apply such a term to Him, to whom both past and future are alike,) is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby, (before the foundations of the world were laid,) he hath constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, the future destiny of every individual of the human race; but it *being* secret to us, and rather an abstract metaphysical truth than a practical doctrine, we leave secret things to God, endeavouring to walk in the obvious paths of duty, and investigating such truths as are useful and may be known.

Election, according to the Scripture, refers not to the future salvation of individuals, but to the peculiar religious privileges bestowed upon nations and aggregate bodies of men, in distinction from those who are less favoured.

"Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture; and in our doings, that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us, in the word of God." And this conclusion follows directly from the immediately foregoing principles, though most lamely from the corresponding ones of the Episcopalian creed.

ART. XIV. OF WORKS OF SUPEREROGATION.*

Voluntary works, besides, over and above God's commandments, which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught, without arrogancy and impiety. For, by them, men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake, than, of bounden duty, is required; whereas, Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

ART. XV. OF CHRIST ALONE WITHOUT SIN.†

Christ, in the truth of our nature, was made like unto us, in all things, (sin only excepted) from which he was clearly void, both in his flesh, and in his spirit. He came to be a lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of himself, once made, should take away the sins of the world; *or, as some understand this expression, who, by the exertions in which he fell a sacrifice, furnished the means of removing the sins of the world;* and sin, as St. John saith, was not in him. But all we the rest (although baptized, and born again in Christ) yet offend in many things; and, if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

ART. XVI. OF SIN AFTER BAPTISM.‡

Not every deadly sin, willingly committed after baptism, is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin, after baptism. After

* Copied entire from the Prayer book.

† Copied entire from the Prayer book, with the addition of the lines in Italics.

‡ Copied entire from the Prayer book.

we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and, by the grace of God, we may arise again, and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned, which say, they can no more sin, as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

ART. XVII. OF PREDESTINATION AND ELECTION.

Predestination (if we may dare to apply such a term to Him, to whom both past and future are alike,) is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby, (before the foundations of the world were laid,) he hath constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, the future destiny of every individual of the human race; but it *being* secret to us, and rather an abstract metaphysical truth than a practical doctrine, we leave secret things to God, endeavouring to walk in the obvious paths of duty, and investigating such truths as are useful and may be known.

Election, according to the Scripture, refers not to the future salvation of individuals, but to the peculiar religious privileges bestowed upon nations and aggregate bodies of men, in distinction from those who are less favoured.

"Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture; and in our doings, that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us, in the word of God." And this conclusion follows directly from the immediately foregoing principles, though most lamely from the corresponding ones of the Episcopalian creed.

ART. XVIII. OF OBTAINING ETERNAL SALVATION.

They are to be accounted in a pitiable error, who presume to say, that the revelation by Christ was altogether unnecessary. For Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men might be saved. Nevertheless, we dare not condemn, but rather commit with confidence to the justice and mercy of God, that man, of whatever law or sect, who being deprived of the blessings of the Gospel, is diligent to frame his life according to the law of reason, and the light of nature.

ART. XIX. OF THE CHURCH.*

The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things, that, of necessity, are requisite to the same.

As the Church of Hierusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred, so also the Church of Rome, *and some other churches that we could name*, have erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.

ART. XX. OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH.*

Any church hath power, *among its own members*, to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith. And yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing, that is contrary to God's word written; neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy

* Copied entire, with the addition of the words in italics.

Writ, yet as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so, besides the same, ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed, for necessity of salvation.

ART. XXI. OF THE AUTHORITY OF GENERAL COUNCILS.

General councils have unlimited authority with every one, who regards their decisions as conformable to the light of reason, and the declarations of Scripture.

ART. XXII. OF PURGATORY.*

The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, worshipping, and adoration, as well of images, as of reliques, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God.

ART. XXIII. OF MINISTERING IN THE CONGREGATION.

"It is not lawful, for every man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent," whose moral characters are pure, whose talents for public instruction are considerable, whose motives are sincere, whose acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures is accurate and extensive, and who have been set apart for the work by some solemn public act.

ART. XXIV. OF SPEAKING IN THE CONGREGATION IN SUCH A TONGUE AS THE PEOPLE UNDERSTANDETH.*

It is a thing, plainly repugnant to the word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church, to have public prayer in the Church, or to minister the sacraments, in a tongue not understanded of the people.

* Copied entire.

ART. XXV. OF THE SACRAMENTS.*

Sacraments, ordained of Christ, be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will toward us; by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.

There are two sacraments, ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.

Those five, commonly called sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for sacraments of the gospel, being such as have grown, partly of the corrupt following of the apostles, partly are states of life allowed by the Scriptures, but yet have not like nature of sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible signs or ceremony, ordained of God.

The sacraments were not ordained of Christ, to be gazed upon, or to be carried about; but that we should duly use them. And in such only, as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation; but they, that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as St. Paul saith.

ART. XXVI. OF THE UNWORTHINESS OF THE MINISTERS, WHICH HINDERS NOT THE EFFECT OF THE SACRAMENTS.*

Although in the visible Church, the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the word and sacra-

* Copied entire.

ments, yet, forasmuch as they do not the same, in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by his commission and authority, we may use their ministry, both in hearing the word of God, and in receiving the sacraments.

Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith, and rightly, do receive the sacraments ministered unto them; which be effectual, because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.

Nevertheless, it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that inquiry be made of evil ministers, and that they be accused by those, that have knowledge of their offences, and finally being found guilty, by just judgment, be deposed.

ART. XXVII. OF BAPTISM.*

Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others, that be not christened, but it is also a sign of regeneration, or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they, that receive Baptism rightly, are grafted into the Church, the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed, faith is confirmed, and grace increased, by virtue of prayer unto God. The baptism of young children, is, according to the opinion of some unitarians, to be retained in the church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ; whilst others believe in the necessity of adult baptism alone.

* Copied entire, with the exception of the last sentence, which is *altered.*

ART. XXVIII. OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

On the whole, we adopt the following statement, with all the modifications and explanations contained in it, from the Articles of the Church of England.

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love, that Christians ought to have among themselves, one to another, but rather it is a sacrament of our redemption, by Christ's death; insomuch that to such, as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise, the cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean, whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is faith.

The sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not, by Christ's ordinance, reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

ART. XXIX. OF THE WICKED WHICH EAT NOT OF THE BODY OF CHRIST, IN THE USE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.*

The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press, with their teeth, (as St. Augustine saith) the sacrament of the *Body* and Blood of Christ, yet, in no wise, are they

* Copied entire.

partakers of Christ; but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing.

ART. XXX. OF BOTH KINDS.*

The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people; for both the parts of the Lord's Sacraments, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.

ART. XXXI. OF THE ONE OBLATION OF CHRIST, FINISHED UPON THE CROSS.†

The offering of Christ once made (which, as some of us understand, means his death incurred *in the act of proclaiming* the free, sovereign, and unpurchased mercy and pardon of God to repenting men) is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ, for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.

ART. XXXII. OF THE MARRIAGE OF PRIESTS.‡

Bishops, priests, and deacons, are not commanded by God's laws, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage; therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry, at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.

* Copied entire.

† Copied entire, with the addition of the words in parenthesis.

‡ *Copied entire.*

ART. XXXIII. OF EXCOMMUNICATE PERSONS, HOW THEY ARE TO BE AVOIDED.

That person, which by open denunciation of the church, is rightly cut off from the unity of the church, and excommunicated, ought to be regarded, by the whole multitude of the faithful, with exactly so much abhorrence, and avoided with exactly so much care, as the heinousness of his moral delinquencies deserves, until he exhibits proofs of a return to virtue and holiness.

ART. XXXIV. OF THE TRADITIONS OF THE CHURCH.

We subscribe to the following article, though we would first enter our protest against the establishing of such a *common authority* as is therein mentioned. When it is once established, the whole article follows of course.

It is not necessary, that traditions and ceremonies be, in all places, one, or utterly like; for, at all times, they have been divers, and may be changed, according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners; so that nothing be ordained against God's word. Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, (that others may fear to do the like) as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren.

Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of

the Church, ordained only by man's authority; so that all things be done to edifying.

ART. XXXV. OF THE HOMILIES.

The two books of Homilies were very good productions for the times in which they were written, and with some exceptions are principally adapted to the Church of England.

ART. XXXVI. OF CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS AND MINISTERS.

Bishops and Ministers ought to be consecrated according to such forms, and on such principles, as the churches they are appointed to serve, judge most agreeable to Scripture and propriety.

ART. XXXVII. OF THE POWER OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATES.*

The power of the civil magistrates extendeth to all men, as well clergy as laity, in all things temporal; but hath no authority, in things purely spiritual. And we hold it to be the duty of all men, who are professors of the Gospel, to pay respectful obedience to the civil authority, regularly and legitimately constituted.

ART. XXXVIII. OF CHRISTIAN MEN'S GOODS, WHICH ARE NOT COMMON.*

The riches and goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as certain anabaptists do falsely boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

* Copied entire.

ART. XXXIX. OF A CHRISTIAN MAN'S OATH.*

As we confess, that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men, by our Lord Jesus Christ, and James, his apostle, so we judge that the Christian religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear, when the magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity; so it be done, according to the prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth.

Here we might leave our reputation for capacious belief to the candid and well judging. Let it henceforth never be hinted, with faint and supercilious sneers, that "really, one cannot tell what unitarians *do* believe," and that "their religion seems to consist in the easy exercise of believing nothing at all." To free ourselves, however, from all anxiety on the subject, and to show, that our merits on this point are a little beyond theirs who arrogantly assume the character of the sole orthodox, we will take the liberty to subjoin the unitarians'

FORTIETH ARTICLE.

Although a vast majority of unitarians would without doubt immediately subscribe to the foregoing articles, yet God forbid they should ever make such an act the sole condition of christian communion, or the sole medium of access to the exercise of the christian ministry. Whatever be the utility of creeds, confessions, and subscriptions, it is presumptuous in the extreme to insist upon a perpetual and unalterable conformity to their original draughts. Religion, it is true, is the same in one age, that it was in another.

* Copied entire.

But not so the language in which religion is conveyed, nor the interpretation which the best and wisest men of different ages put upon the words of Scripture. Such instruments as the foregoing list of articles, may be occasionally well-adapted to the purpose of embodying the existing amount of religious knowledge at any given period, and may serve as rallying points of union among private individuals, or distinct and scattered communities of christians. But never let them be converted into snares of conscience, nor fetters of the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. Above all, let not the thirty-nine articles of Unitarianism be proposed as an infallible standard of unexamining belief for all coming time, lest they should hereafter degenerate into withered anilities, tottering far behind the steady march of more enlightened ages, or remaining as miserable monuments for future unitarians and students of the Scripture to hold up to scorn. G.

Observance of the Lord's Day.

The general principle that we are all bound to the conscientious observance of the Lord's Day, according to the best lights we can obtain concerning the proper mode of passing it, is that which I shall endeavour to illustrate and defend. If all men could be brought to assent to and act upon this principle, it is evident that all coercive laws would be unnecessary, because their great object would be secured.

The proposition which I would lay down on the subject is this; that the man who in a Christian coun-

try violates unnecessarily and habitually the sacred character of the Lord's day, is neither *a Christian*, *a good citizen*, *a man of moral feeling*, nor *a man of humanity*. He disregards alike the gospel, the good order of the community, the sentiments of morality, and the happiness of his fellow men, as well as of the lower creation.

1. He is not a Christian. Our Lord does not indeed re-enact the fourth commandment in its original form. *That*, as well as all the other parts of the Mosaic ritual, was undoubtedly designed for the peculiar circumstances of the Jews; and the change from the seventh to the first day of the week, is alone a sufficient proof, that it is not to be considered as *literally*, and in all particulars, applicable to Christians. Yet so far as the reasons which entered into the first appointment of the day continue applicable to us, we are bound to regard them. It must certainly be allowed that the objects of keeping alive the religious sentiment; securing repose for the labouring classes of the community, and the domestic animals; all which were regarded by the divine founder of the Jewish theocracy—are equally considerations for all mankind, who acknowledge the same merciful and unchangeable God. They certainly also derive great force from the circumstance, that the original law of the Sabbath is introduced among those ten solemn commandments, pronounced from "the awful top" of Sinai, which comprise those universal duties of mankind, the obligation of which no time can impair, and no change of condition can abrogate or alter.

Our Saviour himself gave us his high example for the observance of the Sabbath, though indeed accord-

ing to its real and original uses, and not with the overstrained scrupulosity, or rather affectation of scrupulosity, which distinguished the Pharisees of his day.

The apostles also, we know, held their religious assemblies on the first day of the week, immediately after the resurrection of our Lord, and with their practice coincides the universal custom of all their followers throughout the whole of Christendom, from their age to the present.

Indeed, no one who admits the religious utility of the appointment of some stated time for public worship, can hesitate to admit the utility, and consequent Christian obligation, of an universal exemption of the various classes of the community from the calls of business and pleasure. No one to whom the existence of the Christian religion in the community is dear; no one who seeks to cherish its influence most effectually on his own heart, or to see it produce its best effects on the hearts of others, will allow himself to disregard and violate an institution, certainly of apostolic authority, and which is now so interwoven with the Christian system, as justly to be considered essential to its existence in every religious community. It is not too much to say then, that no person, taking such views as these of the origin and authority of the Lord's day, and yet unnecessarily and habitually violating its sacred character, can lay claim to the name of Christian.

2. No one, who regards the present peace and virtue, and with them the best interests of society, will give an example of disrespect to this sacred day. A day of general rest, as we have already intimated, seems essential to the purposes of public worship and

instruction. The reason of this is obvious. If it is to be desired that public worship should exist at all, and assemblies be collected, this must be done at stated times, and regular intervals. Hence the necessity of the appropriation of a day, which the whole community shall be at liberty to devote to this purpose; for unless this appropriation is stated, uniform and general, it is easy to see that the practice would either be entirely neglected, or perpetual confusion and interference would ensue. The propriety of a regular and general retirement from the usual occupations of life on this day, rests on the same ground as the importance of public worship. If then the utility of public worship be admitted, as keeping alive a belief of the existence, providence, and retributive justice of God, and sustaining the general standard of moral sentiment among all classes of the community, it is not necessary that a man should be a Christian, it merely requires that he should have the common principles of a good citizen, should seriously regard the tranquillity and order of society, connected as they always are with the existence and authority of the restraints of religion, to induce him to pay respect to this day.

This is an argument, one would think, which would be felt by some who would not be influenced by a better. It is not enough to say—with a humility which after all you do not sincerely feel—that your single example is of no importance. No man's example can be wholly insignificant, unless he is confessedly wholly worthless and contemptible. And if you have a right to make an exception of yourself from the general obligation of observing the rest of this day, others also

may claim an equal right; and it is, therefore, evident, that there can be no medium between a complete denial of this right to any, and an absolute abandonment of it to all.

3. In the third place, it may be remarked, that no man of any moral sentiment whatever, no man who thinks it important, for any reason, that the moral and intellectual powers of the human race should be cultivated and improved, can allow himself to violate the sacred character of this dav. To the immense majority of mankind it is this pause in the labours, diversions, and tumults of life alone, which gives them any leisure and opportunity for retirement, reading, and serious thought and contemplation. If the course of human business, labour, or diversion, were absolutely uninterrupted—as it would be in the present crowded state of society, in many portions of Christendom, if there were no intervention of a day of rest and worship—it is really to be feared, nay, it is not to be doubted, that the majority, sparing no time from the pursuit of gain, would become wholly ignorant, vicious, and brutal; that men of every profession would suffer; and that not only the very name and knowledge of the gospel would be lost, but the general sentiment of the obligations of morality which now exists, would give place to a complete worldliness and utter profligacy, of which we have hitherto seen no example.

No one then, who does not maintain the extravagant absurdity, that the souls of the rich alone are worthy of any care and improvement, will permit himself to do any thing to impair the general reverence of mankind for this sacred day.

4. A disregard of the Christian Sabbath is inconsistent with the common feelings of humanity. We must recollect that it is, and ever must be, the condition of a majority of mankind to be employed in labour. The only period of peace and repose, which they can securely possess, is found on this day. The prospect of its regular return cheers and encourages them. It is indispensible to their health and comfort. The peculiar sanctity of this day tends to correct the evils which would arise, and which we know have arisen, from the return of mere *holidays*, which they would feel themselves at liberty to spend in sloth, intemperance, or gross indulgencies. The civilization of mankind, and the happiness of the labouring classes, have most rapidly increased since the establishment of Christianity, accompanied as it every where has been with regular returns of public instruction, worship, and cessation from labour.

He, therefore, who impairs the respect for the Sabbath in the community by his personal disrespect for it, does what he can to undo what the gospel has effected. He says to the poor labourer, "Your happiness and virtue are beneath my regard. I will not make the smallest sacrifice of my pleasure or my caprice, for the sake of assisting to secure your best interests. It is true, that by giving you an example of disrespect for this institution, as far as my example is of any value, I am destroying the power of moral sentiments and religious obligation in your heart; I am contributing to undermine your greatest safeguard from utter degradation; I am depriving you of the few pleasures and consolations, which your hard condition in this life permits you to enjoy—but what are such

considerations as these to a man of spirit and of fashion, who is above vulgar prejudices, and who cannot be expected to have leisure to employ his thoughts upon those, who are so much below him?"—This you say is the language of a fiend, and not of a man!—It is the language of the *conduct* of every man, who voluntarily and habitually violates the sacred character of this day.

There is another consideration, which will act with great force on the mind of a man of humanity, to make him respect the sacred rest of the Sabbath; it is the refreshment and repose, which are thus given to the brute creation employed in the service of man. It is grateful to observe that this circumstance is considered in the commandment given by God himself to the Jewish nation, and that thus are mingled the gentle sounds of compassion with the thunders of Sinai. There is something inexpressibly sweet in the idea of a pause in the labours and sufferings of the lower animals, out of regard to the God of the Sabbath; of the patient ox released from his yoke; the faithful camel stooping to be relieved from his load; the generous horse disburdened of his rider; and all the animals in the service of man forgetting their subjection, and reposing undisturbed under the protection of religion, enforcing the laws of mercy. Can he then be said to know any thing of the sentiments of humanity, who wantonly and unnecessarily breaks in upon the privileges of these faithful and uncomplaining servants of man, and makes them know the difference of this day from others, only by the *increase* of their sufferings and toils?

Such are some of the grounds on which a religious respect to the Lord's day is claimed, not merely of every Christian, but of every good citizen, every man of moral feeling, and every man possessing the common principles of humanity. S. C.

To a Friend, on the Death of his Son.

By Væsemsky.

From the second volume of Bowring's Russian Anthology.

As in the mid-day sun the flower
  Looks brightest, and then bends its head,
So fell thy son—how short his hour
  Of bliss—how rapidly he fled!

Yet o'er his cradle—o'er his tomb,
  An everlasting day-light shone;
A promise of bright days to come—
  Why came he—only to be gone?

As mounts the incense to the skies,
  A towering cloud—with cold, pale cheek
Thou saw'st him to his Maker rise,
  And his own blessed country seek.

He gave to thee his last, last sigh,
  Ere yet he heaved his latest breath;
He turn'd to thee his dying eye,
  Ere it was mantled o'er by death.

Thou hadst indulged the sweetest dream
  Which hope e'er built, or time decay'd;
And in the future's distant beam,
  Thy son a friend, a brother made.

The hours of youth's delightful reign
  And rapture's early spring-tide joy,
Thou in his smiles hadst shared again,
  And in thy boy wert twice a boy.

That vision is departed—sleep
  Soon leaves the weary mortal eye;
Go—with his funeral cypress—weep;
  Thy spirit's peace is slumbering nigh.

With thine my mingling tears I'll bring—
  Their bitterness he cannot know;—
The morning rose I'll o'er him fling—
  He was a rose of morning too.

Church and State.

From the Salem Gazette.

It is not at all to the honour of our country, or to the credit of the literary enterprise of our booksellers, that a complete and elegant edition of the writings of Washington has never been published. His sentiments on any subject would be entitled to attention and respect.

In 1789, when he visited New England, the *Presbytery* of the Eastward convened at Newburyport, and presented to him an address, in which they said;—

"Among the objections to the Federal Constitution we have never considered the want of a Religious Test, that grand engine of persecution in every tyrant's hand. but we should not have been alone in rejoicing to have seen some *explicit* acknowledgement of the only true God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent, inserted some where in the *Magna Charta* of our country;

Such are some of the grounds on which a religious respect to the Lord's day is claimed, not merely of every Christian, but of every good citizen, every man of moral feeling, and every man possessing the common principles of humanity. S. C.

To a Friend, on the Death of his Son.

By Væsemsky.

From the second volume of Bowring's Russian Anthology.

As in the mid-day sun the flower
  Looks brightest, and then bends its head,
So fell thy son—how short his hour
  Of bliss—how rapidly he fled!

Yet o'er his cradle—o'er his tomb,
  An everlasting day-light shone;
A promise of bright days to come—
  Why came he—only to be gone?

As mounts the incense to the skies,
  A towering cloud—with cold, pale cheek
Thou saw'st him to his Maker rise,
  And his own blessed country seek.

He gave to thee his last, last sigh,
  Ere yet he heaved his latest breath;
He turn'd to thee his dying eye,
  Ere it was mantled o'er by death.

Thou hadst indulged the sweetest dream
  Which hope e'er built, or time decay'd;
And in the future's distant beam,
  Thy son a friend, a brother made.

The hours of youth's delightful reign
  And rapture's early spring-tide joy,
Thou in his smiles hadst shared again,
  And in thy boy wert twice a boy.

That vision is departed—sleep
  Soon leaves the weary mortal eye;
Go—with his funeral cypress—weep;
  Thy spirit's peace is slumbering nigh.

With thine my mingling tears I'll bring—
  Their bitterness he cannot know;—
The morning rose I'll o'er him fling—
  He was a rose of morning too.

Church and State.

From the Salem Gazette.

It is not at all to the honour of our country, or to the credit of the literary enterprise of our booksellers, that a complete and elegant edition of the writings of Washington has never been published. His sentiments on any subject would be entitled to attention and respect.

In 1789, when he visited New England, the *Presbytery* of the Eastward convened at Newburyport, and presented to him an address, in which they said;—

"Among the objections to the Federal Constitution we have never considered the want of a Religious Test, that grand engine of persecution in every tyrant's hand. but we should not have been alone in rejoicing to have seen some *explicit* acknowledgement of the only true God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent, inserted some where in the *Magna Charta* of our country;

We are happy to find, however, that this defect has been amply remedied in the face of all the world, by the piety and devotion in which your first public act of office was performed, by the religious observance of the Sabbath, and of the public worship of God, of which you have set so eminent an example, and by the warm strains of christian and devout affections which ran through your late proclamation for a general *thanksgiving.*"

To this address, which was more pious than polite, Washington with his characteristic prudence and wisdom made a reply, from which we extract the following;

"The tribute of thanksgiving which you offer to the *gracious Father of Lights*, for his inspiration of our public councils with wisdom and firmness to complete the National Constitution, is worthy of men, who, devoted to the pious purposes of religion, desire their accomplishment by such means as advance the *temporal* happiness of their fellow men. And here, I am persuaded, you will permit me to observe, that *the path of true piety is so plain as to require but little* POLITICAL *direction.*

"To this consideration we ought to ascribe the absence of any regulation respecting religion from the MAGNA CHARTA of our country. To the guidance of the ministers of the Gospel this important object is, perhaps, more properly committed. It will be your care to instruct the ignorant, and to reclaim the devious; and in the progress of morality and science, to which our government will give every furtherance, we may confidently expect the advancement of true religion, and the completion of our happiness."

Mediatorial Office of Christ.

We have lately read a very interesting sermon, preached at Newburyport by the Rev. Mr. Pierpont of Boston, from the text, *What think ye of Christ?* Matthew xxii. 42. It is the object of this discourse to show, that so far as the *mediatorial character* of Christ is concerned, the question of his physical nature is of no importance. The author contends that if the message of Jesus was brought from God, and is a message of light, truth, and immortality, it little becomes those to whom it is brought, to dispute about the dignity of the *medium* through which they received it. "Should a man come forth," he says, "among his fellow men, bearing with him miraculous evidence that *his mission was divine*, that man must speak as moved by the infinite Spirit that sent him, and all that he should teach, in relation to the object of his mission, must be the truth of God. It is of little consequence to me whether this man has, or has not, any thing superhuman in his physical nature. I care not, nor need I care, whether he was born, and is sustained, according to the ordinary course of our nature as mortal men, nor yet whether, simply as a herald of truth, he is in any degree a partaker of our nature. Let him bring me unquestionable evidence that he is a messenger from God—make me certain of that fact,—and I ask not any one to 'declare his generation.' Let his nature be as humble as it may, his message is no *less* than the truth of God; and it is no *more* than the truth of God, let his nature be as exalted as it may."

The argument is thus concluded,

"Since then, the grace of God, which bringeth salvation to all men, hath appeared in the mission and ministry of Jesus Christ, let us not turn aside to vain jangling, giving heed to 'endless genealogies which minister questions, rather than godly edifying,' let those genealogies relate to what subject they may. Let us leave things that are doubtful, with the certain conviction that as God has wisely left, we may safely leave them doubtful. The knowledge which God has seen to be most valuable, he has made most plain to us. This knowledge he has given us for high and holy ends; and to such ends it becomes us faithfully to apply it. We know that 'there is one God and one mediator between God and men,—even the man Christ Jesus.' We know that he was a teacher sent from God, for no man could have done the things that he did, had not God been with him. We know that we shall be judged according to the deeds done in the body; and we know that to them who seek for glory, honour, and immortality, by a patient continuance in well doing, shall be rendered eternal life. Whatever may have been, whatever is, the physical nature of Christ—we know that the fruit of his spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, benevolence, faith, meekness, temperance; and we know, and let it be our study and our prayer that we may never seem to forget, that if the spirit of Christ be not in us, producing these peaceable fruits of righteousness, we are none of his. For this knowledge let us be grateful;—grateful to all those by whose ministry we have received it, and above all, grateful to the Father of lights, from whom came down the good gift—even the perfect gift—of the gospel. This good gift let us clasp to our bosoms, in joy and in sorrow, and in the light of its instructions, and in the strength of its hopes, let us deny all ungodliness, and every worldly lust, and live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, that it may thus appear, at the last, that in Christ Jesus we have been redeemed from all iniquity, and purified unto him, as a peculiar people, zealous of good works."

To all this we heartily say amen; but we would not be understood to say, nor would the author be understood to say, that the nature of Christ is not a subject of important interest, as it regards the credibility and honour of our religion, the stability of our faith, and the satisfaction of our reason. If, indeed, we could

induce the orthodox to grant that the Saviour may be a Saviour to us, although we cannot believe him to be perfect God and perfect man; and that Christianity may still be Christianity, although divested of what they call its mysteries; if we could prevail on them to reach out to us the hand of fellowship, although we could not join them in ascribing equal power and glory to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and in signing creeds which we could not understand—a great point would be gained. But they will not do this. And so it is proper, if there were no other reason for it, that the controversy should be carried on—and with spirit too.

Spirit of Orthodoxy.

It is stated in a communication to the *Christian Repository*, a periodical work published at Woodstock, Vermont, that a presbyterian clergyman from the city of New-York made the following assertion before a General Association of Calvinist ministers convened at Acworth, New Hampshire. In giving an account of the number of churches in New-York, he said, that they were not all privileged with the preaching of *the gospel;* as there were two Universalist Churches, one Quaker, one Catholic, and one Unitarian, in which the ordinary *means of grace* were not enjoyed.—Some appropriate remarks on this effusion of illiberal spleen are made by the writer of the communication. For our own part we deem it enough to say, that if that clergyman himself enjoys any means of grace whatever, it is a pity and a shame that he makes no better use of them.

More Spirit of Orthodoxy.

One of the notes appended to the *Eighth Annual Report of the American Education Society*, presents a tabular view of the several colleges in the United States, from which we extract the following statement with regard to the two principal ones.

"*Harvard University;* Number of students 302—number of pious students 9—time of last revival 1740—number of hopeful converts *none*—moral or theological societies 2.

"*Yale College;* Number of students 373—number of pious students 115—time of last revival 1820—number of hopeful converts 40—moral or religious societies 1."

And who are ye, that judge another man's servants? How do you know who is pious, and who is not pious at these institutions? Can you look into the closets, can you look into the *hearts*, of the young men at Cambridge, and arrive at such a precise knowledge of their spiritual state, as to be authorized to tell the world, that there are but *nine* in the whole university who love and fear God? And do those you call pious at Newhaven, come forward and thank God they are not as those publicans, that thus you are enabled to count their heads, and write down *one hundred and fifteen?* Accustomed as we are to the misrepresentations of the orthodox, we do believe that we never met with a more glaring piece of impudence and arrogance than this. If we are using harsh language, it is exactly what the occasion demands. We feel indignant; and cannot say, and do not wish to say, soft things of this pre-

sumptuous arithmetic, this miserable summing up of souls. We are friendly to the cause of education; we rejoice to see young men properly educated for the gospel ministry—but if *this* is the spirit which the Education Society instils, it were better that their pupils had never come within the reach of their patronage; better that they had been left to follow the plough, or beat upon the anvil, or hire themselves as servants, ay, or beg in the streets—any thing that would be *innocent.*

Obituary of Judge Toulmin.

From the National Intelligencer.

Died, at his place of residence, in Washington county, Alabama, on the 11th of November in his 57th year, the Hon. Harry Toulmin, late a judge of the District Court of the United States, for the District of Mississippi.

Mr. Toulmin was descended from a very ancient and respectable family in England. He was born at Taunton in Somersetshire. His father, Dr. Joshua Toulmin, was as distinguished for his piety and benevolence, as for his literary and scientific acquirements. Under such a father, and at one of the principal dissenting seminaries of England, was the subject of this notice educated for the church. He was settled, for a number of years, as a dissenting minister, at Chowbert, Lancashire. About the commencement of the French revolution, when party feeling ran high, Judge Toulmin became obnoxious to the ruling party, from the freedom with which he wrote, and the bold-

ness with which he supported the principles of liberty and the rights of man; and as, in consequence thereof, there existed, against him, considerable persecution, he sought that country whose cause he had embraced, and dedicated himself to its service. In the year 1798 he landed at Norfolk, in Virginia, where he was received with that respect and cordiality of feeling which his talents and principles deserved. In 1794 he was appointed President of the Transylvania Seminary, in Kentucky, to which state he removed; he continued at the head of that Seminary between two and three years, after which he was chosen Secretary of State of the State of Kentucky, in which office he remained until 1804, when he was appointed Judge of the Federal Court for the Mississippi territory, and removed thither the following year. He was chosen to digest the laws of that territory, and finished their compilation in 1807. On the formation of the State of Alabama into a separate government, he served in the Convention, and assisted in the formation of the constitution, and has since served in the Legislature of the state as a Representative. During the last year he was appointed to digest the Laws, which service was performed to the acceptance of the Legislature. The personal character of the deceased is thus summed up by his faithful biographer; "He placed not his happiness in ostentation, but referred the whole to conscience, and sought the reward of his virtues, not in the clamorous applauses of the world, but in the silent satisfaction which results from having acted well."

"*The Christian.*"

THE first number of a weekly paper, with the above title, was issued at Philadelphia on the 24th of last month. It is devoted chiefly to the support of liberal views of religion. A perusal of its original articles has led us to anticipate the most beneficial consequences from its dissemination. The following extract is from the editorial address.

"We this day present to our readers the first number of 'the Christian,' the chief object of which, as we stated in our prospectus, is, to explain, defend, and enforce the principles of a scriptural faith, and to promote piety towards God, and benevolence to man. Our aim is to awaken a spirit of free inquiry on religious subjects, to turn the public attention from human formularies of faith to the study of the sacred writings, to bring into more general use the true principles of scriptural interpretation, and to exhibit to our readers the religion of the SON OF GOD, in its primitive purity, simplicity, and beauty.

"We respectfully solicit the patronage of all such as are friendly to these objects, to whatever sect or denomination of christians they may belong. If we know ourselves, we are not induced to engage in the present work by a spirit of sectarism, but by a spirit of love for the truth. Believing as we do, that religion is incomparably the most important subject that can possibly engage the human mind, and persuaded as we are, that its prevalence and effects will correspond very much to the manner in which it is presented to the understanding and heart, we feel it to be our most sacred duty to do what, through the good providence of Almighty God, we find to be in our power, toward the promotion of religion, *pure and undefiled*, among our fellow men."

The design of this paper includes literary articles, original and selected poetry, and a summary of passing events. What has been given in the present number, in these departments, is full of interest. If our good opinion can be of any service to the conductors, we give it heartily, together with our best wishes for their success.

ness with which he supported the principles of liberty and the rights of man; and as, in consequence thereof, there existed, against him, considerable persecution, he sought that country whose cause he had embraced, and dedicated himself to its service. In the year 1798 he landed at Norfolk, in Virginia, where he was received with that respect and cordiality of feeling which his talents and principles deserved. In 1794 he was appointed President of the Transylvania Seminary, in Kentucky, to which state he removed; he continued at the head of that Seminary between two and three years, after which he was chosen Secretary of State of the State of Kentucky, in which office he remained until 1804, when he was appointed Judge of the Federal Court for the Mississippi territory, and removed thither the following year. He was chosen to digest the laws of that territory, and finished their compilation in 1807. On the formation of the State of Alabama into a separate government, he served in the Convention, and assisted in the formation of the constitution, and has since served in the Legislature of the state as a Representative. During the last year he was appointed to digest the Laws, which service was performed to the acceptance of the Legislature. The personal character of the deceased is thus summed up by his faithful biographer; "He placed not his happiness in ostentation, but referred the whole to conscience, and sought the reward of his virtues, not in the clamorous applauses of the world, but in the silent satisfaction which results from having acted well."

"*The Christian.*"

THE first number of a weekly paper, with the above title, was issued at Philadelphia on the 24th of last month. It is devoted chiefly to the support of liberal views of religion. A perusal of its original articles has led us to anticipate the most beneficial consequences from its dissemination. The following extract is from the editorial address.

"We this day present to our readers the first number of 'the Christian,' the chief object of which, as we stated in our prospectus, is, to explain, defend, and enforce the principles of a scriptural faith, and to promote piety towards God, and benevolence to man. Our aim is to awaken a spirit of free inquiry on religious subjects, to turn the public attention from human formularies of faith to the study of the sacred writings, to bring into more general use the true principles of scriptural interpretation, and to exhibit to our readers the religion of the SON OF GOD, in its primitive purity, simplicity, and beauty.

"We respectfully solicit the patronage of all such as are friendly to these objects, to whatever sect or denomination of christians they may belong. If we know ourselves, we are not induced to engage in the present work by a spirit of sectarism, but by a spirit of love for the truth. Believing as we do, that religion is incomparably the most important subject that can possibly engage the human mind, and persuaded as we are, that its prevalence and effects will correspond very much to the manner in which it is presented to the understanding and heart, we feel it to be our most sacred duty to do what, through the good providence of Almighty God, we find to be in our power, toward the promotion of religion, *pure and undefiled*, among our fellow men."

The design of this paper includes literary articles, original and selected poetry, and a summary of passing events. What has been given in the present number, in these departments, is full of interest. If our good opinion can be of any service to the conductors, we give it heartily, together with our best wishes for their success.

Ordination at Biddeford.

On Thursday, the 15th of January, the Rev. Thomas Tracy was ordained pastor of the Second Religious Society in Biddeford, Maine. Introductory prayer by Rev. Dr. Parker of Portsmouth, N. H. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Nichols of Portland; Ordaining prayer by Rev. Mr. Fletcher of Kennebunk; Charge by Rev. Mr. Webster of Biddeford; Right Hand of Fellowship by Rev. Mr. Felton of Scarborough; Concluding Prayer by Rev. Mr. Marrett of Standish.

We learn from a communication in the Christian Register, that the ordination of Mr. Tracy was opposed by a remonstrance signed by *five* individuals, who stated, as the sole ground of their dissent, that they had not been consulted on the subject *as a church.* The ordaining council unanimously determined that the remonstrants could not consistently raise an objection on this plea, because it was provided by the rules and regulations of the very society to which they belonged, that communicants "shall not individually or collectively exercise or be entitled to any powers, privileges, or prerogatives in ministerial or religious affairs, in which the religious society at large are interested, only in common with the other inhabitants belonging to said society." These regulations were made when the Society was established, in 1797, and are a remarkable proof of the correct and enlarged views of those who drew them up. The decision of the council in this instance, is likewise a proof, that liberal notions of congregational discipline are gaining ground among us.

THE

UNITARIAN MISCELLANY

AND

CHRISTIAN MONITOR.

No. XXXIX.] MARCH, 1824. [Vol. V.

Virtue the great End of Christianity.

THE principal object of religion is to inculcate the moral duties, and furnish motives and aids to the discharge of them. This appears to us so obvious a truth, that we are almost afraid of appearing trite in offering any remarks for the purpose of illustrating and enforcing it. Yet it is a truth, which is in danger of being forgotten or neglected, in consequence either of a disposition to find something marvellous in religion, a fondness for abstract parts of controversy, an ardour of natural temperament in some, that requires to be constantly supplied with objects of excitement, or indolence, that prompts others to seek an easier and shorter road to heaven, than that of fidelity in observing the precepts and submitting to the restraints of the gospel. It is the error of the present, and has been perhaps, of all ages, to place goodness in something else, than enlightened piety, and a tenor of life uniformly consistent with rectitude and benevolence.

If any thing we can say, has the effect of recalling men to the plain old path of virtue or moral righteousness, of impressing on their minds, in deep and per-

manent characters, the sentiment, that they have something to do, as well as something to believe and enjoy, we aspire to nothing more—we would be useful at the hazard of losing the praise of profoundness and originality.

First then, we observe, religion is designed to inculcate the moral duties; to teach the necessity of moral excellence, true goodness, virtue. Let us reflect for a moment, upon the demand it makes of us, and we shall perceive that it exacts as a preparation for the favour of God and for happiness, simply a performance of the duties, that belong to us in our several stations, from pure motives and feelings. It considers us in our several capacities and relations, as we stand connected with God and with each other. It demands exertions and duties corresponding to these capacities and relations. It inculcates piety towards God, united with subjected appetites and passions, and with benevolence displayed in acts of kindness and charity to our fellow men. "What doth the Lord thy God require of thee, but to do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with thy God?" "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and keep himself unspotted from the world;" that is, to perform offices of compassion and charity, and shun the vices that prevail in the community around us.

Further, we are taught, that we shall hereafter receive according to our works; that a distinction will be made between those who have done good, and those who have done evil. Those who have fed the hungry, given drink to the thirsty, clothed the naked, ministered to the wants of the stranger, the sick, and the

prisoner, shall, at the last day, be accepted; while those who have neglected offices of compassion and humanity, shall be cut off from happiness. The moral duties are in the foregoing, and in numerous other passages of the Scriptures, distinctly inculcated. Our Lord, it may be observed, in discoursing to the people from the mount, is occupied almost exclusively in explaining and enforcing them.

The importance attributed to them may be inferred from various parts of the sacred writings, in which they are not formally described. We are instructed to consider, that faith is no further useful, than it is productive of good works, acts of rectitude, kindness and mercy;—though great enough to remove mountains, it is of no avail without these.

Appearance, profession, pomp and show of religion, are not all. A tree is not valued for its leaves, but for its fruit. Knowledge, correct opinions, and faith, constitute a preparation for a work, not a substitute for the performance of it; they assist our virtue, but are not virtue itself. We are taught, that no opportunity of doing good, or of advancing on the road of excellence is to be lost; no talent is to be abused, or lie unemployed. Those to whom little is given are admonished to use this little well; those to whom much is given must do more.

Religion then demands of us various moral duties. It proposes to secure a faithful discharge of them by exerting an influence over the temper and heart. It demands dispositions as well as actions. It endeavours to form in us correct habits and manners; to compel us, so far as moral instruction has an efficacy, to discharge faithfully all the offices, that become us in the

different situations in which we may be placed. But it is not satisfied with the outward act or appearance. Considering that a right disposition or temper is necessary to constitute the individual virtuous and happy, at the same time that it best secures a performance of all outward acts of duty, it requires purity of heart—good principles and feelings. It enters into the breast to purify and elevate the affections, to restrain the passions and appetites, to correct the obliquities of the will, to remove every polluted, every sinful thought, to create and preserve a pure, holy, virtuous temper, to infuse generous and enlarged affections, and ardent desires of attaining to high moral excellence. It would produce in us such dispositions, that all the moral duties shall flow directly from the heart. It would assist us to lead a good life by giving us those good principles, which constitute the safeguard of virtuous character. The temper it teaches us to seek is of a nature to prevent us from committing any secret offence, to restrain us from all vice, to flow out and diffuse itself in all acts of virtue.

Religion thus demands dispositions that will prompt us to discharge faithfully all the offices we owe to God, to our fellow men, and to ourselves. It does not allow us to omit any of the moral duties; it directs our thoughts to the nature, extent, and obligation of the several classes of these duties. It teaches their worth and importance, without furnishing a particular description of them, when they are such as are well known, or may be readily defined by the common sense of mankind.

The understanding had been sufficient to point out and describe many of these duties. It remained for

revelation to supply those, which had not been thought of; to place them all on the most broad and sure foundation; and enforce them by proper sanctions. One of the chief excellences of Christianity, considered as a revelation, is, that it furnishes the most effectual motives, and aids to duty. The idea has been expressed, that the direct object it proposes is "to supply motives, not rules, sanctions, not precepts." Few are ignorant in what manner they ought to act, but most persons want a motive to duty; they want, at least, strength of motive sufficient to enable them to resist the seductions of the appetites and passions, to overcome the force of temptation. The rules with which they are furnished by the light of the understanding want authority. They may indeed be led by their own reflections to perceive the advantages of virtue, and the regret and misery that often attend vice in the present world; but they have need of a more powerful motive to deter them from the one, and assist them to persevere in the other. Religion supplies this motive. It enforces the practice of our duty by the most efficacious sanctions, by teaching a future state of retribution. It instructs us that a cheerful discharge of our duty with proper views and feelings, will be attended with advantage to ourselves forever. It presents to our thoughts the happy fruits of a good life, which we shall continue to reap throughout eternity. Our imperfect goodness, if it be all of which we are, in the present state, capable, will meet the approbation of our master, and, through the mercy of God, be accepted in the place of perfect righteousness. We are informed, that no act of virtue or benevolence, however little it may cost us, will be forgotten; he that

gives a cup of water only to the thirsty shall not lose his reward. The offer of heaven is made upon condition, that we perform our duty, and serve our Maker faithfully to the extent of our ability. We do nothing, which in a strict sense, merits so great a reward. It is of God's goodness and mercy, that it is granted us.

The reflection that our sincere but feeble endeavours on earth may, in consequence of his liberality and compassion, secure to us felicity without end in heaven, might, one would suppose, furnish an effectual motive to restrain us from folly, and win us to virtue. It places the advantages of virtue in the most clear and forcible point of view. These advantages, extending as they do beyond the present life, are incomparably greater than any of which the unassisted understanding could form a conception.

Let us now turn to the other part of the picture. While the good may confide in the fatherly care of God, and his promise that he will make them hereafter happy, the wicked are taught to expect a fearful retribution. "These," says our Saviour, "shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." Vice shall not taste the happy fruits of virtue. It implies that diseased state of the affections, which is attended with certain misery. The effects of it are not transient. They continue beyond death; and who can tell the sum of wretchedness which they may occasion? Who can measure the gulf, which may hereafter separate those who win heaven, from those who lose it? The scriptures lead us to conclude, that the punishments of a future world are a momentous thing. Of what nature and extent they are, it is impossible for us at present to determine. One thing

will be admitted, however, by every man of reflection, that they are such, that "nothing in this world can make it worth while to incur them. Let a person compute all the pleasures of vice and folly the longest life can promise him, he will find the utmost amount of them immeasurably outweighed" by the loss he will sustain hereafter. This thought should effectually discourage us from sin. It is enough to show, that the sinner makes a foolish, a mad choice.

Religion, then, inculcates the moral duties, and enforces them by powerful sanctions. It supplies those motives, which are wanting without it. It thus teaches with an authority, with which philosophy never taught.

If the views we have presented be correct, there is an inseparable connexion between religion and pure morals, good works, virtue. By virtue is to be understood a "performance of our whole duty." It includes all those good affections, principles, feelings, and habits, after which we are taught by the dictates of reason and the precepts and example of Jesus to aspire. To produce in us this virtue, is the great end, which moral and religious instruction labours to accomplish. The primary object of God, in conversing with man through prophets and messengers, has been to render him better, to deter or recall him from sin, to assist him in becoming and remaining virtuous. This is the principal object of *all* the discoveries, the precepts, the promises and threatenings, the institutions and ordinances, of the gospel; the object of the life and ministry of Jesus, of his instructions and example, of his sufferings and death. "He gave himself for us,

that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify to himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."

Would we know then whether our religion is efficacious, whether our hopes of being saved by it are well founded? Does it minister to good dispositions and virtue? Does it render us diligent in discharging our duty in our several relations and circumstances? Is our faith productive of acts of justice, kindness, and mercy? It has then a value; our hopes of heaven are then well founded. We build on a rock against which the winds shall for ever blow, and the tempest beat in vain.—But if, while we make high pretensions to faith and piety, our lives are immoral and vicious, our habits loose and careless, our hearts cold, selfish, worldly—let us fear—for our religion is but a name. We have not yet partaken of the spirit of Christ, and they that have not his spirit are none of his. We build on a frail foundation—our hopes are traced in sand—the floods will soon blot them out forever.

What is the worth of our religion, if it does not extend an influence over the temper and conduct? What is its value, if it is only a dress thrown around us? What, if it wastes itself in controversy about points of an abstract and shadowy nature, mistakes fanaticism for piety, the suggestions of a heated imagination for illuminations of the spirit, and morbid states of feeling for sensible touches of grace? Let it go with us into the world to chasten and refine our pleasures, to restrain our passions, to exalt our feelings and views, to purify and ennoble our characters. Let it teach us patience in trials, forbearance, meekness, candour in judging and speaking; let it rekindle our cooling charity, and minister warmth to the kind

affections. It is then we display its power; then may we expect to enjoy its consolation in affliction, and its hopes in death. It will enliven the chamber of sickness, become the support of age, and a guide to immortality and heaven. A. L.

Liberality of the Quarterly Review.

Mr. Editor,

Notwithstanding the high ground which the Quarterly Review has sometimes thought fit to take upon points of orthodoxy, yet, such is the vast information and enlightened philosophy of its conductors, that it frequently meets the friends of free inquiry on their own standing, and astonishes us with its liberality and good sense. I recollect, at this moment, in proof of my statement, the concession of that work respecting the disputed passage in John's First Epistle, and particularly the compliment recently paid to our excellent countryman, Dr. Channing, and the copious extract which followed from his Dudleian Lecture. I now enclose for your insertion another very interesting passage to the same purpose, taken from the fifty-seventh number, the last which has been printed in this country. I could wish, Sir, that Dr. Miller, and many of his nervous friends, who take such palpitating alarms at the apparently latitudinarian views of unitarians, would read and ponder this passage well. I could also wish that the Quarterly Reviewers themselves would sometimes attend a little to their own principles, when they think it their duty, for mere church and state purposes, to pour their contempt and odium upon the

poor unitarians. The extract about to be given, besides presenting a proof of a truly catholic spirit, exhibits some interesting matters of biblical criticism, with which your readers will probably be much gratified and instructed. I shall mark in italics the paragraph most nearly touching the unitarian controversy.

Having devoted nearly the whole of a very profound and learned article to the argument which modern discoveries in geology furnish in favour of the Scripture account of the deluge, the Reviewers strike off into another topic in the following manner.

"But the deluge is not the only point in geology, which is closely connected with the Holy Scriptures. It is, in fact, as was before observed, but a small part of that field, to which the researches of the geologist are directed. The more the strata which compose the crust of the earth, are examined, the stronger evidence do they present of revolutions and catastrophes occurring at wide intervals of time, of slow progressive advancement to its present state, and of the existence of various orders of created beings, which successively occupied its surface before it was finally fitted for the abode of man. These phenomena, or rather the principles on which they are explained in the modern schools of geology, have been thought to militate against the history of the creation, contained in the first chapters of Genesis. The difficulty has been fairly stated by professor Buckland, in his Inaugural Lecture some years ago published; and we think he has acted judiciously in not coming to any peremptory conclusion upon this disputed question.

"The usual mode of solving the difficulty, has been to interpret the six days of the creation, not as na-

tural days, determined by the revolution of the earth on its axis, but as indefinite periods of time; and to this explanation, Mr. Buckland seems disposed in that lecture to incline. Others object to it with great vehemence, as wholly incompatible with the institution of the Sabbath, which is manifestly set forth as the seventh day; and therefore they contend that the other six must necessarily be regarded as days in the same sense, and of the same kind.

"Instead of presuming to decide peremptorily in this matter, our object will rather be to caution the friends of religion against a rash and possibly mischievous mode of vindicating their opinions. We beseech them to bear in mind that similar alarm has been taken, and similar zeal manifested for the cause of religion, in several instances, which have all terminated in establishing the points so much dreaded; and yet christianity, so far from receiving a shock, has only emerged from the controversy with increased vigour and lustre. It is hardly necessary to remind them of the persecutions raised against the first teachers of the Copernican system of the universe. The doctrine was pronounced to be contradictory to the language of holy writ, and was accordingly condemned as false and impious. Nay, so late as the early part of the eighteenth century, when the Jesuits' edition of Newton appeared, it was thought necessary by the editors to prefix an advertisement, disclaiming all belief in the system thus demonstrated, because it had been declared unscriptural by the church, and setting it forth only as a series of deductions from a false hypothesis.

"We would call to their recollection also the opinions formerly maintained, as to the plenary and even lite-

ral inspiration of Scripture—the clamour raised against the first collections of various readings in the copies of the New Testament—and still later against those of the Old. Vossius, we know, came forward as a champion to vindicate the inspiration of the Septuagint version; and it was by many deemed impious to suppose that Almighty God would commit the transmission of his word to the same accidents and errors, to which all human compositions are liable.

"*Well indeed is it for us that the cause of revelation does not depend upon questions such as these; for it is remarkable that in every instance the controversy has ended in a gradual surrender of those very points which were at one time represented as involving the vital interests of religion. Truth, it is certain, cannot be opposed to truth. How inconsiderate a risk then do those advocates run, who declare that the whole cause is at issue in a single dispute, and that the substance of our faith hangs upon a thread—upon the literal interpretation of some word or phrase, against which fresh arguments are springing up from day to day!*

"Why, for instance, must we be compelled to understand the word *day*, in the first chapter of Genesis, precisely in the same sense it now bears, viz. the period of the earth's rotation on its own axis? Certain it is from the narrative itself, that the word does not bear the same meaning throughout that chapter; for the first three days were passed before the creation of the sun is mentioned; and yet in these, no less than in the others, the portion of time is denoted by the words 'evening and morning;' which according to their received import, necessarily suppose the existence of the sun. Let us not, however, be misunderstood. We

are firmly convinced that the institution of the Sabbath is a divine ordinance from the beginning—that the observance of it is enjoined as commemorative of the close of the great work of creation, and that its solemn obligation is expressed by the parallel which it pleased God to draw between the progress of his own works, and the destined employment of that being whom he made in his own likeness. Yet no one can believe, when it is said God *rested* from his works, that he really underwent fatigue and required repose. The same principle of accommodation to our perceptions and modes of speaking must be admitted here as it is in a thousand other passages of Holy Scripture. Our *duty* cannot be mistaken, whatever interpretation we may put upon the disputed words; and it is this duty which it is the main purpose of that volume to declare and to impress upon us.

"We would further ask those who contend for the strict letter of Scripture, and for the mystical correspondence of the several days of the week with the order of the creation, upon what authority they have transferred the character of Sabbath from the seventh to the first day? The *reason* we do not ask for, for that is well known, but the *authority*. The answer must be, that in this particular a constructive and traditional rule has been allowed gradually to supersede a positive command. Nay, it is well known, that within the church itself the practice has varied. For although the Lord's day has from the first been the weekly festival of Christians, yet the transfer of the Sabbatical *rest from labour* to that day was by no means uniform, nor did it form one of the canonical ordinances of the church in the first three centuries.

"Again, let those who tremble for the authority of Scripture, if this point be conceded, recollect, how strict and peremptory the language is in a hundred instances of the Mosaic law, which have been abrogated in practice, without any positive declaration to that effect; and let them consider what a violence must have appeared to be done to the letter, especially in the apprehension of the early Jewish converts, when these observances were pronounced to be matters of indifference and suffered to die away. The apostles themselves, we know, did not all agree in practice upon these points, and yet the divine authority of Scripture was universally acknowledged.

"The Sabbath, it is certain, was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath. Every practical purpose, therefore, which it was intended to serve, is fully answered, whether we conform our physical system to the letter of Scripture or not—whether we consider the chapter of Genesis as setting forth the last formation only, and the final adjustment of our globe to the occupation of man, (in which case the days may be regarded as portions of time equal to our natural days,) or as declaring the whole series of changes the planet has undergone from the beginning of time.

"It is by no means necessary to insist upon either of these interpretations as essential to our faith; and we repeat that the professor appears to us to have acted wisely in not attempting to determine the matter. Of this, however, we are quite sure; that the Scripture requires of us, both in its letter and in its spirit, to respect even the mistaken scruples of our brethren—to suffer errors of this kind, if they be errors, to die of themselves, not attempt to eradicate them with a

violent hand. It teaches us to propose our opinions, when they militate against the conscientious impressions of others, in the most inoffensive form, not to take a malicious pleasure, as is sometimes done, in perplexing the mind or alarming the religious feelings of our neighbour—or to be forward in boasting our own superiority, and our freedom from his prejudices."

Incomprehensibility of God.

For the Unitarian Miscellany.

"I GO FORWARD—BUT HE IS NOT THERE; AND BACKWARD—BUT I CANNOT PERCEIVE HIM."

WHERE art thou—THOU! source and support of all
That is or seen, or felt; Thyself unseen,
Unfelt, unknown,—alas, unknowable!
I look abroad among thy works—the sky,
Vast, distant, glorious with its world of suns,—
Life-giving earth,—and ever-moving main,—
And speaking winds;—and ask if these are Thee?
The stars that twinkle on, th' eternal hills,
The restless tide's outgoing and return,
The omnipresent and deep-breathing air—
Though hail'd as gods of old, and only less—
Are not the Power I seek; are thine, not Thee!
I ask Thee from the past; if in the years,
Since first intelligence could search its source,
Or in some former unremember'd being,
(If such, perchance, were mine) did they behold Thee?
And next interrogate futurity—
So fondly tenanted with better things

Than e'er experience own'd—but both are mute;
And past and future, vocal on all else,
So full of memories and phantasies,
Are deaf and speechless here! Fatigu'd I turn
From all vain parley with the elements;
And close mine eyes and bid the thought turn inward
From each material thing its anxious guest,
If, in the stillness of the waiting soul,
He may vouchsafe himself—Spirit to spirit!
O Thou! at once most dreaded and desir'd,
Pavilion'd still in darkness wilt thou hide thee?
What though the rash request be fraught with fate,
Nor human eye may look on thine and live,
Welcome the penalty! let that come now,
Which soon or late must come;—for light like this,
Who would not dare to die?
Peace, my proud aim!
And hush the wish that knows not what it asks.
Await his will, who hath appointed this,
With every other trial—be that will
Done now, as ever. For thy curious search,
And unprepar'd solicitude to gaze
On Him—the unreveal'd—learn hence, instead,
To temper highest hope with humbleness.
Pass thy novitiate in these outer courts,
Till rent the veil, no longer separating
The Holiest of all—as erst, disclosing
A brighter dispensation; whose results
Ineffable, interminable, tend
E'en to the perfecting thyself—thy kind—
Till meet for that sublime beatitude,
By the firm promise of a voice from heaven
Pledg'd to the pure in heart! E. T.

Mortality and Immortality.

From an Essay upon Epitaphs, by Coleridge.

Simonides, it is related, upon landing in a strange country, found the corse of an unknown person, lying by the sea side; he buried it, and was honoured throughout Greece for the piety of that act. Another ancient philosopher, chancing to fix his eyes upon a dead body, regarded the same with slight, if not with contempt; saying, "See the shell of the flown bird!" But it is not to be supposed that the moral and tender hearted Simonides was incapable of the lofty movements of thought to which that other sage gave way at the moment while his soul was intent only upon the indestructible being; nor, on the other hand, that he, in whose sight a lifeless human body was of no more value than the worthless shell from which the living fowl had departed, would not, in a different mood of mind, have been affected by those earthly considerations which had incited the philosophic poet to the performance of that pious duty. And with regard to this latter, we may be assured, that if he had been destitute of the capability of communing with the more exalted thoughts that appertain to human nature, he would have cared no more for the corse of the stranger, than for the dead body of a seal or a porpoise which might have been cast up by the waves. We respect the corporeal frame of man, not merely because it is the habitation of a rational, but of an immortal soul. Each of these sages was in sympathy with the best feelings of our nature; feelings, which, though they seem opposite to each other, have another and a

finer connexion than that of contrast. It is a connexion formed through the subtle process by which, both in the natural and moral world, qualities pass insensibly into their contraries, and things revolve upon each other. As, in sailing upon the orb of this planet, a voyage towards the regions where the sun sets conducts gradually to the quarter where we have been accustomed to behold it come forth at its rising; and in like manner a voyage towards the east, the birthplace in our imagination of the morning, leads finally to the quarter where the sun is last seen when he departs from our eyes; so, the contemplative soul, travelling in the direction of mortality, advances to the country of everlasting life; and in like manner may she continue to explore those cheerful tracts, till she is brought back, for her advantage and benefit, to the land of transitory things—of sorrow and of tears.

Repentance and Conversion.

REPENT YE, AND BE CONVERTED, is the great and constant call from Heaven to earth, from God to man, from the universal Father to his intelligent offspring, from Him who alone is holy to the weak and erring creatures of his hand. It was made and repeated in the early ages of the world. It was echoed in the thunders of Mount Sinai. It burst from the upbraiding lips of the prophets of Israel. Then a voice was heard proclaiming it from the depths of Judea's wilderness; the voice of that stern and solitary man who came to prepare the way of the Lord. And then the Saviour himself appeared among men; and through the

whole course of his ministry he pronounced it with a distinctness, authority, and power, which were before unknown. He commissioned his disciples to preach it among all the nations of the earth. They did preach it. It still is preached; and it must continue to be preached; it must be reiterated in the ears, and addressed to the hearts and consciences of men, so long as they continue to be men—so long as they have passions and appetites, desires, inclinations, hopes and fears—so long as imperfection is their lot, and happiness their aim.

If you ask what is the reason for this constant call to repentance, I answer, it is this; God constantly desires the happiness of his creatures, and there is no happiness without goodness. With vice it is wholly incompatible. There is no pollution so dreadful as the pollution of wickedness; there are no pangs so bitter as the pangs of remorse; there is no being so miserable as the abandoned sinner. If, therefore, it is impossible that true happiness should be our portion while we continue in sin, it is obvious that we must forsake sin in order to escape from misery; we must no longer remain the bondmen of iniquity, if we would become heirs of God and heaven; in other words, if we would be happy, we must repent. This is the eternal and unalterable law of our nature and condition, the law by which we live and act, and are rewarded. We see then the reason why our Heavenly Father, who is full of compassion, calls his children to repentance; we see the reason why he has from time to time, through the mouth of his prophets and messengers, given to them the injunction, "Wash ye, and make you clean;"

"Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways, for why will ye die?"

But passion is strong, and present pleasures are tempting, and the future is dim, and reason may be deluded, and conscience may be lulled, and though the spirit may be willing, the flesh is weak. We must have some motives presented to us, of more than ordinary weight, to counterbalance the attractions of immediate gratification, and to assist us in overcoming those obstacles and difficulties which lie in the path to our ultimate happiness. Such motives are presented in the sanctions of the gospel. Till the coming of our Saviour they had never been fully revealed. The sanctions of the Jewish law, though adapted to the circumstances of the Jewish people and the condition of the world, were nevertheless imperfect. As the spiritual aids, therefore, which the men of former ages possessed were comparatively small, they are not to be judged by so strict a rule as they will be who enjoy the superior advantages of Christianity. "The times of this ignorance God winked at," said St. Paul to the Athenians, "but *now* commandeth all men every where to repent; because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men in that he hath raised him from the dead."

What the great sanctions of the gospel are, is here plainly intimated. The existence of a future world, and the righteous retributions of that world, were announced to men by the lips of the Son of God, and confirmed to them by his resurrection from the dead. Obedience to a pure and plain and perfect rule of

morality is enforced by considerations, than which it would be impossible to conceive of any more awful and impressive. They lift up the veil between this life and another, and as it were lengthen out the existence of man, without any interruption, and with all his hopes, his fears, and his accountability, through ages which have no end. To such a prospect he cannot surely be insensible; by motives like these he cannot fail to be affected. He is assailed by temptation; but let him reflect, ere he yields to it, that he diminishes by his imbecility the sum of his everlasting good, and adds another pang to the accumulating and safely stored treasure of wrath and remorse. He is willing to abide the immediate consequences of transgression, and says, let them come! but is he willing that they should follow him beyond the grave, and follow him forever? He cleaves to his sins, and every day they acquire a fresh ascendancy over him, and he becomes more and more indifferent to the calls of reputation, and honour, and friendship, and interest; but will he not shake them off with desperate energy, when he knows that they are dragging him lower and still lower down the dark descent of moral degradation, and estranging him further and still further from glory, and joy, and the vision of God? Will he not repent, when he is told that death puts no end to the retribution of his crimes, and that the tomb has no hiding place for his infamy? If he will not, there are no other motives which can be addressed to him in this world—a statue might open its marble lips, and exhort and rebuke him in vain.

Thus does the revelation by Jesus Christ lead men to repentance. It offers to us, as the guide and law

of our conduct, a system of precepts and instructions, which is as pure as the Fountain from which it flows. To observe this law is of course the same thing as to avoid and renounce sin, and live righteously; and to induce such an observance, Jesus Christ submitted to an ignominious death, and afterward rose visibly from the tomb, that we might receive the strongest proof of a future and eternal state, in which every man is to be judged according to his works.

Here we might end our account of the doctrine of repentance. But a great majority of Christians would not be satisfied with so simple an explanation of it. It appears to them in this view too reasonable, distinct, and intelligible, and, perhaps, a little too severe. They must have it more undefined, misty, mysterious, and accommodating; and so for centuries has it been represented to be. Theologians have made quite an intricate and scholastic doctrine of it; and volumes of jargon have been written to prove, that it cannot be understood; for that is what the argument generally amounts to. This continued misapprehension renders it necessary that we should examine more particularly what repentance is.

We may assert in the first place, that it cannot be merely sorrow for our offences. A sigh will never satisfactorily answer the demands of our religion; the tears of a contrite hour cannot wash away the stains of a guilty life—no, nor the stain of a single guilty act. "Godly sorrow *worketh* repentance," says Paul, and such most certainly is its natural tendency; but he does not tell us that it *is* repentance, be it ever so godly. Christian repentance includes the all important circumstance of reformation. To repent, we must not

only bewail our sins, but quit them; we must not only confess the folly and guilt of pursuing the broad road, but turn at once into the path of righteousness and life. The man who has fallen in a slippery way will never mend his condition by mourning and weeping; he must rise, and cleanse himself, and take better heed to his steps in future. "Go, and sin no more," is the language of the Gospel to all offenders.

An application of this remark may easily be made to individual cases. It is no repentance in a thief to deplore his crime, yet still continue to steal; nor in an irascible man to acknowledge the folly and sinfulness of unwarrantable anger, and the next moment fly into a passion at some accident or trifle. The miser's repentance is liberality; the sluggard's repentance is activity; the glutton's and the drunkard's repentance is temperance; the repentance of the envious man is candour; the repentance of the proud man is humility; and the repentance of the bigot—who needs repentance as much as any man—is charity. Whatever our sins and failings may be, we can only repent of them properly by forsaking them, and adopting the opposite line of conduct.

This observation enables us readily to comprehend the meaning of the Scripture phrases of *regeneration* and *being born again;* phrases which have been the innocent cause of so much mysticism. When a sinner renounces his pernicious habits, gives up his evil practices, is influenced no longer by his criminal dispositions, and from being faithless, worthless, earthly and sensual, becomes virtuous, respectable, and holy, he is, morally speaking, no more the same man;—his motives are different, his language is different, his actions

are totally different—he is another man, a new creature—the change which has taken place is to the full as great as if he had been regenerated, born over again. St. Paul uses the same figure, a little modified in the expression, when he tells the Ephesians and Colossians *to put on the new man*, and the Romans *to walk in newness of life.* He means repentance. We mean the same ourselves, and we express ourselves in precisely the same manner, when we say of a person whose character has undergone a thorough reformation, *that he has begun a new life.* By this, we never intend, nor are supposed to intend, any thing supernatural or mystical, any more than that an actual second birth has taken place; and yet if we will but think a moment, we shall perceive that the phrase, *to begin a new life*, is the same as *being born again*, and just as strong a figure—and there is not a more common figure in the language; so common, that when we employ it, we are not sensible that it is a figure.

Repentance, then, is reformation, produced by godly, or sincere and virtuous sorrow. And now let us proceed to a further elucidation of our subject, by considering the meaning of the nearly synonymous word *conversion.* Its literal signification is turning from one thing to another. In both the Old and New Testament, it is used simply in his sense. In Psalms it is said, "And sinners shall be *converted* unto thee." In Hosea the same meaning is expressed by the word *turn;* "Therefore *turn* thou to thy God." The apostle James tells us, that "He who *converteth* the sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death." Here the same sense would have been preserved if the word *turneth* had been substituted. Indeed the He-

brew and the Greek words in the instances adduced, answer to both the English words, and may be translated by either of them indifferently.

Sometimes it is used to express by itself the whole idea of *turning from sin.* Our Saviour, in applying the denunciation of the prophet Isaiah to the Jews of his time, says, "Lest they should be *converted*, and I should heal them." In this passage we must supply the words *from their sins*—Lest they should be converted, or turned, from their sins. When thus used, its signification is exactly that of repentance.

The word conversion is once used in the New Testament to signify, of itself, the idea of turning to the religion of Jesus, becoming a Christian. The passage in which it occurs is the third verse of the fifteenth chapter of Acts. "And being brought on their way by the church, they [Paul and Barnabas] passed through Phenice and Samaria, declaring the *conversion* of the Gentiles; and they caused great joy unto all the brethren." Here, conversion is the term employed to convey the meaning which is elsewhere expressed by such phrases as "turning to the Lord," "believing the Gospel," "obeying the Gospel," and "receiving the Gospel." They all signify the changing of a false and impure or imperfect religion, for a true and holy one; the acknowledgment of a superior rule, superior motives, and superior sanctions.

We are now prepared to consider the question, whether those persons who have always acknowledged the authority of the Christian law, and walked to the best of their ability according to its dictates, can properly be said to need conversion. Is the call, Repent and be converted, of universal application at the pre-

sent day? To this question I decidedly answer, No. But let me not for a moment be misunderstood. We are all imperfect; and the best of us repeatedly transgress the perfect law. All our faults and sins are to be repented of, by being deplored and forsaken. But this is not the conversion of the Scriptures, which generally signifies a change of religion and principles; neither is it the conversion of technical theology, which has been stated in various forms, and with various modifications of obscurity. It is an opinion not by any means uncommon, that the Scriptures require of all men a change of heart, a spiritual and supernatural regeneration, before they can have the least title to salvation, or even to the Christian name. A professor of such a belief would tell us, that though we confessed Jesus to be the Christ and the Saviour of men, though we received his precepts as our guide, and endeavoured to conform our actions to their letter and spirit, yet we must experience a change, repent and be converted, ere we could be saved. Let the answer to all such addresses be this. "You tell me I must repent. Of what shall I repent? Not surely of the nature which God has given me; I cannot repent of that. You tell me I must be converted. To what shall I be converted? To what shall I turn? To whom shall I go? I believe upon him who has the words of eternal life, and am sure that he is that Christ, the Son of the living God. I was taught in my earliest years that his religion was true; and when I was able to examine and judge for myself, my reason confirmed the faith of my childhood. I was enjoined to reverence his character, and obey his precepts; and time has increased my reverence, and enlightened my obedience. I pro-

fess his Gospel; I endeavour to make it the rule of my life; I fear its denunciations, I cherish its hopes, I rejoice at its promises, I feel, and am grateful for its consolations;—to what shall I be converted? You say I must experience a change of heart. I trust that it beats with gratitude to God, and with love toward all mankind—and why should it be changed? It cannot change now, excepting to unholiness, unbelief, indifference, or fanaticism—and Heaven preserve it from such changes as those!"

It may be said that this is the language of pride. It is not. The man of sincerest humility may use it the man, who while he is tremblingly conscious of his failings, is yet too well acquainted with the nature and requisitions of Christianity, to be frightened out of his common sense by the exhortations of misguided zeal, and the mystical perversion of scripture phraseology.

Enough has been said to prepare us for the following conclusions. First; that the Scripture call to repentance and conversion is not addressed, in its original and unlimited sense, to those who from pure and religious motives, lead upright lives. They are already Christians, if there are any Christians; and therefore the same language cannot without violence be applied to them, which was originally addressed to Heathens. They must, to be sure, watch over their ways, and correct whatever they see amiss in their temper and conduct; and they will always find enough which will need correction. This course may indeed be called successive acts of repentance; but a better general term is *improvement.* Improvement is the repentance of Christians.

But it must be remarked in the second place, that the number of such persons is not comparatively large. Even at the present time there are a vast many, to whom the Gospel calls with a loud voice, "Repent ye, and be converted." Birth in a Christian land does not of itself constitute a Christian, although indeed it furnishes means and facilities of being so, by uniting Christianity with our education and early associations, by affording us our share of its general influence on society, and by placing it continually before us, with its restraints on the one hand, and its rewards and consolations on the other. But that man, who, notwithstanding these opportunities, commits habitual sin, and lives without God in the world, is no more a Christian, than if he were the native of a land, on which the light of the Gospel never shone. Christianity is not a system of rites and forms, which we may act over, and then go our ways; nor a creed which is to be repeated on this or that occasion, and then laid aside. It reveals its sublime doctrines to confer authority on its laws; and when the habitual sinner resolves to obey these laws, and perseveres in his resolution, he then becomes a Christian—and not till then. We may truly say of such a person, that he is converted.

And even the habitual sinner is not the only man whose life must experience such a change as deserves the name of conversion. That class of men, whose lives, though on the whole correct, are not regulated by Christian motives, cannot be denominated Christians, and therefore *they* must be converted. They are prudent, to be sure, and perceive that respect, competency, and health, follow in the train of honesty and good habits, and accordingly they keep

themselves within the bounds of decency and order. But though God has in his mercy so connected our temporal interest with our virtue, that they shall in the event coincide, yet circumstances are not unfrequently arising, which set them, for a season, at variance with each other; and on such occasions the temporal interest of the merely prudent man, which had generally recommended a course of uprightness, will now urge in a contrary direction. There are occasions, also, on which temporal interest does not seem to be required to interfere on one side or the other of a question of morality. There are sins which may be committed in perfect secrecy, and which consequently will not, in the eyes of the world, affect the character of him who is guilty of them. But true Christian principle is ever present and ever active, and acknowledges an Eye which sees in secret, and will prompt the man who obeys its authority, to perform a good action, and to refrain from a bad one, in darkness as well as in light, in his inner chamber as well as at the corner of the street—whether there are no regards but those of the Almighty on his doings, or a whole world is looking on to applaud or to condemn.

Finally. If repentance be sincere reformation, if it shows its sorrow for the sins of the past by the virtues of the future, it is not to be neglected or deferred. A man cannot more miserably deceive himself than by supposing that he may go on in his evil courses, adding new strength to old vices, till he comes to the very brink of his grave, and then avert his sentence by a few prayers and tears before he drops into it. God save us from the presumption of prescribing bounds to his mercy or ways to his wisdom! but we may safely

assert, that if we are to be judged by the character which we have formed, it is extremely improbable that such a one can be acquired in a few moments of terror and pain, as is usually the work of time, labour, habit, and care. That the sorrow for past sin, and the promises of amendment, which are extorted by the approach of death and the prospect of futurity, are not often such as would change the character, is evident from the fact, that it rarely is changed when a respite is granted, and that the offender whose life God has spared, after bringing it apparently to its close, very seldom merits his mercy, by spending the remainder of that life in his fear and love. And even on the supposition that a death-bed remorse and resolution possessed a sure reforming power, we could not rely on having the opportunity of exercising those sentiments. Death is often at our side before we have caught the sound of his footsteps, or have had the least intimation of his coming—he strikes and gives no warning of the blow—he cuts down the sinner in the midst of his sins—in the very act of sinning—before one groan can plead his pardon, or one tear be dropped upon his stains. And shall we hazard our eternal state on what to us is a chance, a turn of the balance?

The sum of the whole matter is this. Let him who has always felt the influence of Christian motives, and endeavoured to guide himself by the Christian rule, deplore and amend his failings, cherish his virtues, and go on toward perfection; let the sinner renounce his evil and destructive ways; let the worldly minded adopt higher and purer principles of conduct; and let none be either disheartened or misled by a vain and technical theology, which puts words for things, and

feverish and indefinite excitements for the spirit and power of godliness.

Jeremy Taylor on Death-bed Repentance.

From his Holy Dying.

If therefore any man shall teach or practice such religion that satisfies all our natural desires in the days of desire and passion, of lust and appetites, and only turns to God when his appetites are gone, and his desires cease, this man hath overthrown the very being of virtues, and the essential constitution of religion. Religion is no religion, and virtue is no act of choice, and reward comes by chance, and without condition, if we only are religious when we cannot choose, if we part with our money when we cannot keep it, with our lust when we cannot act it, with our desires when they have left us. *Death is a certain mortifier;* but that mortification is deadly, not useful to the purposes of a spiritual life. When we are compelled to depart from our evil customs, and leave to live that we may begin to live, then we die to die; that life is the prologue to death, and thenceforth we die eternally.

S. *Cyril* speaks of certain people that chose to worship the sun because he was a day-god; for believing that he was quenched every night in the sea, or that he had no influence upon them that light up candles and lived by the light of fire, they were confident they might be Atheists all night, and live as they list. Men who divide their little portion of time between religion and pleasures, between God and God's enemy, think

that God is to rule but in his certain period of time, and that our life is the stage of passion and folly, and the day of death for the work of our life. But as to God *both the day and night are alike*, so are the first and last of our days, all are his due, and he will account severally with us for the follies of the first, and the evil of the last. The evils and the pains are great which are reserved for those who defer their restitution to God's favour till their death. And therefore *Antisthenes* said well, *It is not the happy death but the happy life that makes man happy.* It is in piety as in fame and reputation; he secures a good name but loosely, that trusts his fame and celebrity only to his ashes; and it is more a civility than the *base* of a firm reputation, that men speak honour of their departed relatives; but if their life be virtuous, it forces honour from contempt, and snatches it from the hand of envy, and it shines through the crevices of detraction, and as it anointed the head of the living, so it embalms the body of the dead.

Installation Exercises at Brooklyn.

The Sermon, Charge, Right Hand of Fellowship, and Address to the Society, which were delivered at the installation of the Rev. Mr. May at Brooklyn, Connecticut, have lately been published in Boston. A few sentences from each of these exercises will speak their own commendation.

The Sermon, by the Rev. Mr. Walker of Charlestown, is from the text, *But we preach Christ crucified,*

unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God. Its object is to explain what it is to preach Christ properly and truly, and to defend the general principles observed in their discourses by liberal and unitarian preachers. The following extract may furnish an answer to the charge so often brought against us that we preach *mere morality.*

"Mere moral lectures, which a heathen philosopher might have preached as well, will not answer; nor will pomp of words, or of wisdom; nor ingenious and subtle disquisitions respecting the foundation of morals, or the fitness of things, or the beauty of virtue, or the counsels of a mere worldly prudence. All this may be very well in its place, and it need not be entirely excluded from the pulpit; but it is not preaching Christ; and that minister will find himself to have sadly erred, who depends upon it mainly for success. We find none of it in the discourses of the Saviour—none of it in the preaching of the apostles. It was not by such means, that Christianity was established, or the Reformation begun; nor is it by such means, even at the present day, and notwithstanding all the changes that have taken place, that interest and popularity can be given to any system of doctrines, or the bulk of any congregation be kept awake, or their souls saved from death. *Morality*, it is true, must be preached, and morality chiefly, and almost exclusively; but it must be *christian* morality—a morality founded on christian principles, guarded by christian sanctions, and breathing a christian spirit—a morality, which is the fruit, or rather the expression, of faith—a morality, which looks for its principal motives, encouragements, and examples to the Scriptures—a morality, like that inculcated in the Sermon on the Mount, of the affections, and thoughts, and soul—not a morality of convenience, or mere good nature, or temporary expedients; but one of conviction and fixed principle—a morality including not only our duties to our fellow men, but our duties to our Saviour, and our God; the duties of piety, and devotion, and worship—a morality, not of earth, earthy; but of heaven, heavenly—not confined in its authority or prospects to the world we live in, nor to the narrow bounds of mortal life and mortal experience; but connecting the creature with

the Creator, earth with heaven, time with eternity, and stretching itself out, in all its obligations, motives, and consequences, from everlasting to everlasting. This is the morality which we should preach; and in preaching it we preach Christ—"Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God."

To this paragraph is appended a note, which contains in a few lines as good a commentary on the much abused phrase, *to preach Christ crucified*, as we ever saw. We beg those who may be in the habit of using it, without attaching any very distinct ideas to it, to read this note, and ponder it well.

"Preaching Christ does not consist in sounding his titles, nor in continually dwelling on his personal history, sufferings, or merits; but in preaching *as* HE *preached*, and as his *apostles* preached; in a word, in *preaching the* GOSPEL. Some preachers do, indeed, lay a peculiar emphasis on the word 'crucified,' in our text; as if to 'preach Christ *crucified*,' were to be continually preaching about his crucifixion; or at least about his sufferings and death. Whereas, we should think, that a very moderate share of discernment were enough to convince one, that the meaning of the apostle was simply this;—That they were not ashamed to profess themselves to be the disciples, and to preach the doctrines, of a *crucified* teacher; though they were aware, that this fact in their Master's history would be 'unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness'—offend the prejudices of the former, and provoke the contempt of the latter."

THE CHARGE, by the Rev. Dr. Freeman of Boston, is an exhortation on the duty of a minister as a preacher of the gospel. It is earnest, affectionate, and full of excellent thoughts. He speaks of *speculative* and of *practical* preaching, and lays down rules to be observed in both kinds of composition. From the conclusion of his remarks on the first kind, we extract the following paragraph.

"In fine, let the few speculative sermons, which you deliver, be concluded with a practical exhortation. Point out the connexion which exists between the belief of true doctrines and godliness and

olineas; and whilst you allow that many men, who espouse erroeous sentiments, do honour to the gospel by the sanctity of thei ives, at the same time show, that it is not from their errors, but from be truths, which they mingle with them, this good effect has been lerived. They believe in God, and in the essential doctrines of the ;ospel. They have built a house of precious materials on the foundaion of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief :orner stone; but they have, to their own discomfort, encumbered it with stubble, which in some measure excludes the light of heaven. When however this useless matter is removed, the building, which ias been fitly framed together, will remain; and it will appear to be, what it is in effect, an holy temple in the Lord."

The conclusion of the charge is deeply impressive.

"I CONCLUDE my address with this solemn charge; whenever you meditate the subject of a discourse, consider yourself in the presence of a holy Being, to whom you are accountable for all your words. A belief, that his eye beholds you, will guard your mind against the intrusion of vain thoughts; and it will lead you to reject the subjects, from which a profitable moral cannot be extracted, and which do not tend to promote the glory of God and the interests of religion. In a word, be a devout christian, and you will then be a zealous and edifying preacher. Whilst your meditations are accompanied with humble prayer to the Father of spirits, you will have reason to hope, that he will be graciously pleased to assist you in your sincere endeavours to write his law upon the tablet of your heart, and in your diligent search to find out acceptable words, by which you can impress it deeply on the hearts of your fellow men."

From the RIGHT HAND OF FELLOWSHIP, by the Rev. Mr. Peabody, of Springfield, we make the following quotation, alluding to the situation of the church.

"The brethren of this church and society will receive our congratulations! You have stood fast in the liberty, with which Christ hath made you free; and he hath rewarded your fidelity at last. We sympathize with your joy, which ought not to be less; we sympathize with your hopes, which will not be disappointed. Well may we rejoice with you; for a delightful vision of happiness is opening, not to you only, but to the land in which you dwell. The spirit of dissension has been abroad; and we have been troubled with those angry questions, that engage men's hearts precisely in proportion, as the

mildness and purity of christianity forsakes them. You have been denied the christian name; you have had your offered hand of fellowship cast rudely away; we rely upon you to resist these injuries with the armour of light, and to answer ungenerous reproaches only with the eloquence of a pure and holy example. For a better day is breaking upon the world; the skies are red with its dawning, and man can no more resist it, than he can stay the moving of the sun."

There is an apostolical simplicity and directness in the ADDRESS TO THE SOCIETY, by the Rev. Dr. Thayer of Lancaster, which to us is delightful. Take for example the two first paragraphs.

"It was in our heart to come and help you, because we heard o your order and the steadfastness of your faith in Christ. Your trials and labours, patience, and perseverance have gained for you a deep interest in our sympathy and kindness, good wishes and prayers. God forbid, that we should sin against the Lord, in ceasing to care and pray for you.

The state of the christian community, your local situation, the good confession you have witnessed, and a solicitude for the interests of truth and our common christianity urge us to put you in remembrance of your new and continual duties. We earnestly desire, that you may be built up in the faith and order of the gospel; that you may have the privilege and honour to be fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God."

We have a right to be proud of productions like these before us—independent, classical, and spiritual. They are a complete answer to all the uncharitableness, reviling, and misrepresentation with which we and our principles and our preaching are assailed. God grant that we may always be able to make such an answer, together with that of a free conscience, an innocent heart, and an upright life.

THE

UNITARIAN MISCELLANY

AND

CHRISTIAN MONITOR.

No. XL.] APRIL, 1824. [Vol. V.

Efficacy and Obligation of the Lord's Supper.

THIS division of our subject is inseparably connected with the last.* *The efficacy* of the Lord's Supper is to be determined from its nature and its design—from what it is adapted, and what it was intended to effect. This is so evident, that it admits of no question; and this being granted, it follows most certainly and undeniably, that if in its nature and design it is a commemoration of our Saviour, and nothing more, all that can be advanced concerning its efficacy, must rest on this view of it, and on this alone. As soon as we come to talk of a design which was never expressed, of influences which were never promised, and of effects which were never intimated, by Jesus or his apostles, at that moment do we forsake the only true guide on this subject, which is the Scriptures, and enter a labyrinth of error and darkness.

To inquire, therefore, what is the efficacy of the communion, is to inquire what effects will naturally be produced by a solemn remembrance of our Lord.

* Contained in the number for last December.

The bread which we eat, in partaking of his Supper, represents his body which was broken on the cross; the wine which we drink, represents his blood, which was shed for the remission of sins. His death is thus forcibly impressed on our minds; the affecting circumstances which accompanied it are vividly painted to our imagination. The unfeeling, traitorous disciple, who came in the dead of night, at the head of a band of ruffians, to seize him in the garden of Gethsemane; the false, malicious, frivolous testimony, upon which he was condemned; the indignities, blows, and tortures, which were heaped on him in the palace of the high priest; the infuriate multitude, thirsting for his blood, and clamouring for his crucifixion in the judgment hall of Pilate;—the awful scene of that ignominious death; the innocent sufferer, stretched upon the cross between two thieves; the soldiers and the crowd below him, for the forgiveness of whom, even at that hour, he prayed; the exclamation of bitterness which nature would extort from him; his burning thirst; his dying words;—the darkness; the earthquake; the dead who had long slept, coming forth from their open graves into the world of living men;—all these circumstances and events connected with the last moments of him whose death we commemorate, pass in sad procession before us.

But we cannot reflect on these mournful scenes, without also reflecting that they took place to serve one great end—which is our salvation. We do not think of our Master's death, without also thinking of the purposes for which he died. In the natural course of human sympathy, we are strongly affected by a review of his sufferings; but this is not all—our hearts

are still more deeply touched, when we consider, that it was for our sakes he bore them. We hasten from the cross to the tomb; where we are told by two angels of light, that our Lord is not there, but IS RISEN! His ignominious crucifixion becomes closely united in our thoughts with his glorious resurrection; and our souls are lifted up to the heaven, to which he has ascended, and the contemplation of God, to whose right hand he is exalted. The most lively gratitude is excited by the momentous and affecting truth, that Jesus laboured thus incessantly, and suffered thus severely, to redeem us from the wretched slavery of sin, to lead us out from the thick shades of ignorance, and guide us to the path of safety and happiness; to furnish us with hopes and consolations, which should direct and animate our holy endeavours, support our fortitude in the trials of life, preserve us steadfast amid its changes, strengthen us under the burthen of its woes, heal our spirits when wounded and our hearts when broken, wipe away our tears, hush our repinings, and lead us through all the vicissitudes of a fleeting world, to another and a brighter, which will never pass away.

The stated commemoration of our Lord would, however, be little better than useless, if it produced nothing but feelings and reflections. But this can hardly be the case. Feelings and reflections like those which I have described, are almost necessarily practical. We cannot be the disciples of Christ, unless we receive his instructions; he cannot be our Saviour, unless we obey his laws. We cannot become the heirs of his promises, unless we perform the conditions which are annexed to them. Therefore, if true gratitude for the blessings purchased by his death, finds its way

The bread which we eat, in partaking of his Supper, represents his body which was broken on the cross; the wine which we drink, represents his blood, which was shed for the remission of sins. His death is thus forcibly impressed on our minds; the affecting circumstances which accompanied it are vividly painted to our imagination. The unfeeling, traitorous disciple, who came in the dead of night, at the head of a band of ruffians, to seize him in the garden of Gethsemane; the false, malicious, frivolous testimony, upon which he was condemned; the indignities, blows, and tortures, which were heaped on him in the palace of the high priest; the infuriate multitude, thirsting for his blood, and clamouring for his crucifixion in the judgment hall of Pilate;—the awful scene of that ignominious death; the innocent sufferer, stretched upon the cross between two thieves; the soldiers and the crowd below him, for the forgiveness of whom, even at that hour, he prayed; the exclamation of bitterness which nature would extort from him; his burning thirst; his dying words;—the darkness; the earthquake; the dead who had long slept, coming forth from their open graves into the world of living men;—all these circumstances and events connected with the last moments of him whose death we commemorate, pass in sad procession before us.

But we cannot reflect on these mournful scenes, without also reflecting that they took place to serve one great end—which is our salvation. We do not think of our Master's death, without also thinking of the purposes for which he died. In the natural course of human sympathy, we are strongly affected by a review of his sufferings; but this is not all—our hearts

are still more deeply touched, when we consider, that it was for our sakes he bore them. We hasten from the cross to the tomb; where we are told by two angels of light, that our Lord is not there, but IS RISEN! His ignominious crucifixion becomes closely united in our thoughts with his glorious resurrection; and our souls are lifted up to the heaven, to which he has ascended, and the contemplation of God, to whose right hand he is exalted. The most lively gratitude is excited by the momentous and affecting truth, that Jesus laboured thus incessantly, and suffered thus severely, to redeem us from the wretched slavery of sin, to lead us out from the thick shades of ignorance, and guide us to the path of safety and happiness; to furnish us with hopes and consolations, which should direct and animate our holy endeavours, support our fortitude in the trials of life, preserve us steadfast amid its changes, strengthen us under the burthen of its woes, heal our spirits when wounded and our hearts when broken, wipe away our tears, hush our repinings, and lead us through all the vicissitudes of a fleeting world, to another and a brighter, which will never pass away.

The stated commemoration of our Lord would, however, be little better than useless, if it produced nothing but feelings and reflections. But this can hardly be the case. Feelings and reflections like those which I have described, are almost necessarily practical. We cannot be the disciples of Christ, unless we receive his instructions; he cannot be our Saviour, unless we obey his laws. We cannot become the heirs of his promises, unless we perform the conditions which are annexed to them. Therefore, if true gratitude for the blessings purchased by his death, finds its way

into our bosoms, it must be accompanied by a desire to deserve them; and this desire will be the same as a determination to discharge our duty, as it is laid down to us in his Gospel. "This is my body," says Jesus, "*which is given for you;* this do in remembrance of me." While we eat therefore, of the symbol of that body, and remember with sympathy the circumstances of his death, we remember also that it was for our sakes he suffered, and resolve that for us he shall not be crucified in vain, but that we will strive with all our energies to make ourselves worthy of the immortality which he has revealed, and to add to the number of those who shall sit down with him in the kingdom of his Father. "This cup," he adds, "is the new testament in my blood, *which is shed for you;*"—or in other words, "This wine represents the blood which is shed to confirm the new covenant of God with man, and to finish the new dispensation of mercy which is offered to you and to the world." While, therefore, we drink that wine, we remember the blameless victim whose blood it signifies, and dedicate our hearts and lives to the sacred cause of truth, which he died to promote, and the exercise of that holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.

If such be the *efficacy* of the Lord's Supper, arising from its *nature and design*, as a commemoration of his labours, sufferings, and death, it will be easy to determine what is its *obligation;* for when we inquire into the duty of partaking in the communion, it is the same as if we asked, what are the benefits which will result from such an observance, and what are the evils which will be the consequence of its omission. The benefits of observing it, I have just been enumerating;

the evils of neglecting it will be identified with the spiritual and moral wants which the loss of those benefits will occasion. That commemoration of our Saviour, which powerfully invites us to imitate and obey him, and which is naturally productive of holy thoughts, good resolutions, and virtuous actions, must be eminently beneficial to us; and as the rite of his Supper is peculiarly adapted to promote those ends, and as it is the commemoration which he himself appointed for the purpose, the obligation of performing it is surely of the highest and strongest kind, an obligation both of interest and of gratitude,—and if we disregard it, our punishment will be the natural and inevitable consequences of the omission of our duty, and neglect of an important mean of virtue and holiness, pointed out to us in the last injunctions of our Master.

From the account which has been given of the nature, design, and efficacy of the Lord's Supper, it will also be easy to determine *the proper qualifications of communicants.* And here is the advantage of adhering closely to the scriptural relation. The divisions of our subject depend mutually on each other, and every question arising from it is settled at once by reference to the supreme authority. WE MUST NOT LEAVE THE BIBLE. This is an exhortation which I cannot too frequently repeat; for I am sure that the Scriptures will lead us to simple and satisfactory results on this subject, and that it has been by wandering from their guidance, that men have plunged themselves into so many disputes, doubts, superstitions, follies, and fears.—If then we find from the words of our Saviour, that his design in establishing this rite, was to keep

alive the memory of his death and resurrection, and thereby to increase our faith, to give animation to our hopes, and strength and activity to our good resolutions—then is it certain, that they who feel a reverence for his character, a deep sense of the blessings, supports, assistances, and consolations, which he suffered and died to secure to sinful man, a cheerful disposition to receive him as their master, and an earnest desire to keep his precepts and obey his laws, are qualified to come to his table—are not only qualified, but invited, commanded, bound to come there. These conclusions are inevitable; there is no avoiding them; and he who professes to make the Scriptures his rule of belief must either admit them unreservedly, and conform his conduct to them, or suffer his conduct to contradict his convictions. I know that many people are deterred from approaching the communion by an idea that it demands a particular preparation, and imposes something like an ascetic rigour of manners and life. But there is not a word in the Scriptures, which countenances such an idea; there is not a word which implies that this rite is a seal of perfection, that it shuts and locks the door on the innocent gaieties and amusements of the world, or that it requires a way of life which is not equally required by all the motives and sanctions of religion. What can be more vain, indeed, than to talk of assuming new religious obligations?—a creature of God assuming new obligations! As if it were possible that any new obligations could be incurred by a mere assent of the individual; as if to have been formed and fashioned, nourished, supported, defended, enlightened and blessed by a merciful Providence, were not a claim to the whole of

our gratitude, service, and love. They who do not acknowledge this claim cannot be addressed as Christians, and with such I have nothing to do; but to those who do acknowledge it, I would say, how can the nature of that claim be altered hereafter by a simple declaration of your own, by repeating a few words, or signing your name to a form of belief? Your present enjoyments are either innocent, or they are not; if they are, where do you learn that such enjoyments are forbidden? If they are not, where do you learn that you can pursue unlawful pleasure at any time, without manifesting ingratitude, and forfeiting the favour of God?

Nothing can be further from my intention, than to give an impression that the communion of the Supper is to be regarded as an indifferent, thoughtless celebration. After what I have said on the former divisions of the subject, as well as on this, it is unnecessary for me to assert, that I consider it as a solemnity of the most useful, serious, and affecting nature. But I also consider it as a mean of promoting and confirming holiness, rather than as a necessary indication of extraordinary virtue, a token of monastic gloom and severity, and a terror to all the permitted delights and relaxations of existence.

I know that a humble timidity and fear of touching holy things with unholy hands, is a cause why many defer their attendance on this rite to some future period, when they shall feel more confident of their spiritual qualifications. But such misgivings, though they deserve to be treated tenderly, are not the less erroneous. They conduct the individual who listens to

them, to that very neglect of duty, which he so anxiously desires to avoid.

There is nothing to countenance these scruples—if we leave out of the question, as we ought, mere human custom and authority—but a misconception of a passage in St. Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians. As many have been prevented from approaching the communion table, by understanding this passage apart from its connexion with others, and without reference to the circumstances of the case, I shall here quote and explain it. It immediately follows the account of the institution, which has already been copied, and extends from the twenty-seventh verse to the end of the eleventh chapter.

"Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body. For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep. For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened by the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world. Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another. And if a man hunger, let him eat at home; that ye come not together unto condemnation. And the rest will I set in order when I come."

It would be sufficient for my purpose to observe, that the occasion which drew the above remarks from the apostle, was one which never occurs now in any

decent and sober community of Christians, and probably never will. We learn from different parts of the chapter before us, that the Corinthians were in the habit of conducting themselves in the most tumultuous and disgraceful manner at the Lord's Supper, making it, instead of a serious commemoration of their Saviour, a scene of contention, gluttony, and riot. In the twentieth and two following verses, St. Paul thus rebukes them. "When ye come together, therefore, into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper. For in eating, every one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken. What? have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the church of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you in this? I praise you not. For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you;"—and he then proceeds to relate the institution of the Supper; proving to them by so doing, that as a memorial of a master who laid down his life for their good, it should be observed with solemnity, and that nothing could be more ungrateful and unseemly, than to make it an occasion of disorder and intemperance. This was indeed to eat the bread and drink the cup of the Lord *unworthily*. But who would think of committing the same crime now? Who would think of being guilty of a shocking indecorum, which could only have been possible among new converts, who were ignorant of many of the important principles of the religion which they had adopted, and who had just emerged from utter moral darkness? Who would think of making the communion a feast—of carrying his separate provision with him—of shaming his poorer neighbour by

the display of greater abundance and luxury? These are the abuses against which the apostolic warning is directed; and to whom can it be applicable at the present day?

Though the above consideration ought of itself to hush the fears of the conscientious, yet there are some obscurities in the passage cited, which it will not be amiss to explain. "Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily," says the apostle, "shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." What is meant by eating and drinking in this ordinance unworthily, has already been shown;—they do so, who forgetting or slighting the solemn signification of the elements, partake of them in a disorderly or irreverent manner. And such are "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." But St. Paul does not surely mean to say, that the guilt even of this unfeeling behaviour, is as great as that incurred by the murderers of Jesus. And though this is the apparent sense of the English translation, it is by no means the signification of the original. The Greek word (ενοχος) here rendered *guilty*, has a variety of meanings, which depend on the connexion in which it stands. In Mark xiv. 64, it is properly translated *guilty*,—"And they all condemned him to be guilty of death." But in Mark iii. 29, Hebrews ii. 15, and some other passages, it cannot be so rendered. Take for example the verse in Hebrews; "And deliver them who through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage." Here the same Greek word is translated *subject to*, and will not bear the other sense. In the passage before us, it has precisely the same force as in James ii. 10, where it has been in the same manner mistrans-

lated. "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." That St. James did not intend to say what our translators have made him express, is apparent both from the nature of the case, and from the context. How can he, who breaks one law of God, be actually as guilty, as he who breaks them all, or five, or two of them? The writer had no intention of advancing so strange a proposition; and in the next verse he supplies us with a commentary, and fixes the meaning of the word which we are considering. He continues, "For he that said, do not commit adultery, said also, do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law." By disobeying one commandment of God, the offender shows a disregard to that divine authority, which is the source of all of them, and is consequently guilty of disrespect to them all. This is exactly the meaning of the same word as used by St. Paul. By partaking of the communion in an indecent manner, the Corinthians gave evidence that they were unmoved by the remembrance of their Saviour's sufferings, which the Supper was designed to commemorate, and thus *became guilty of disrespect to the body and blood of the Lord.*

"But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." That is, let him seriously consider the purposes and signification of the rite, and the affecting circumstances of its institution, and in this manner bring himself to a fit state of mind for its observance.

"For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." By "not discerning the Lord's body,"

is meant, not making that distinction between the common and sacramental use of bread and wine, which the design of the ordinance requires—not respecting them as the symbols of Christ's body and blood. The word *damnation* is not to be taken in its theological sense, but in that of *condemnation* or *punishment;* and what the punishment was, is declared in the following verse—"For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep." The penalty, therefore, was a temporal one, necessary to preserve the purity and respectability of a new religion, and inflicted in order to save the guilty from a more terrible and lasting chastisement, or as is said in the thirty-second verse, that they "should not be condemned with the world."

The remainder of the passage may be easily understood, with the assistance of the foregoing explanations.* It relates entirely to circumstances in the

* To give a connected view of it, however, I will here subjoin the paraphrase of Locke, commencing with the verse which immediately precedes it.—"So that the eating of this bread, and the drinking of this cup of the Lord's Supper, is not to satisfy hunger and thirst, but to show forth the Lord's death till he comes. Inasmuch that he who eats this bread, and drinks this cup of the Lord, in an unworthy manner, not suitable to that end, shall be guilty of a misuse of the body and blood of the Lord. By this institution therefore of Christ, let a man examine himself, and according to that let him eat of this bread, and drink of this cup. For he who eats and drinks after an unworthy manner, without a due respect had to the Lord's body, in a discriminating and purely sacramental use of the bread and wine that represents it, draws punishment on himself by so doing. And hence it is many among you are weak and sick, and a good number are gone to their graves. But if we would discriminate ourselves, i. e. by our discriminating use of the Lord's Supper, we should not be judged, i. e. punished by God. But being punished by the Lord, we are corrected, that we may not be condemned hereafter with the unbeliev-

Corinthian church, which cannot be expected to take place at the present time, and in the present state of christianity. There is nothing in it to alarm the conscientious, or to affect the conclusions which we have asserted with regard to the qualifications of communicants. The rite of the Supper was instituted by our Lord a short time previous to his mournful death. It was intended as a memorial of the sufferings which he underwent for our sakes, and to excite those affections and determinations within us, which result in holy living and charity. Let all therefore who acknowledge the mission of Jesus Christ, and desire to imitate his character, and live according to his precepts, assemble around his table with reverence and soberness, but without scruple and without fear.

Sir Isaac Newton's Unitarianism.

Mr. Editor,

In reading Sir Isaac Newton's History of the text of the Three Heavenly Witnesses, lately published in the fourth number of Mr. Sparks's valuable Collection of Theological Tracts, I could not but be curious to observe whether, in the course of his discussions, he

ing world. Wherefore, my brethren, when you have a meeting for celebrating the Lord's Supper, stay for one another, that you may eat it altogether, as partakers all in common of the Lord's table, without division or distinction. But if any one be hungry, let him eat at home to satisfy his hunger, that so the disorders in these meetings may not draw on you the punishment above mentioned. What else remains to be rectified in this matter, I will set in order when I come."

has let fall any expressions, either inadvertently or intentionally, which may set forth his opinions clearly, as to the merits of the doctrines involved in the text itself. I will communicate to you the remarks which I made from this point of view, as I perused the tract.

1. The general impression on looking at the whole piece, is, that Sir Isaac Newton must have disbelieved the doctrine of the trinity. Otherwise, why did he not take care to let his sentiments be known? Why not guard against misconceptions on the part of the reader? Why not protest that the doctrine stood on other and stronger grounds, and did not need the support of this spurious text? This is what a real Trinitarian would have done, and what all modern Trinitarians, who have fought against the authority of the text, have most sedulously taken heed to do. But not a word of all this do we find in Newton. There is throughout a tone of sarcasm and triumph against the defenders of the passage, and of sympathy with its opposers. In his first section, where we should most expect to see him explicit, he does indeed by suggestion, rank Unitarianism as a "heresy," and its opposite doctrine as "the faith;" but who does not see that he here refers only to what had been generally established by the church, and not to his own private opinions? If there is any doubt upon this point, I think it must be removed by the remarks now about to succeed.

2. In section fourth, he tells us, that "in our age," the text of the three heavenly witnesses "*is chiefly insisted upon*," in disputes about the trinity. That very text he labours like a giant to overthrow, and

succeeds; but shows no regret at its loss, and offers no substitute in its stead.

3. In the same section further on, in quoting the expression, "the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost," as it is used in the form of baptism, he calls it, "*the place from which they tried at first to derive the trinity.*" I must say, that this sentence is conclusive with me as to the philosopher's theology. It almost amounts to a contemptuous blow levelled against all the ancient Trinitarians, and against the very doctrine itself.

4. In section sixth, he says, "so then this interpretation seems to have been invented by the Montanists for giving countenance to their trinity." This would imply, that the trinity is not *Newton's* trinity at least.

5. In section fourteenth, speaking of the spurious text, as quoted in the trinitarian controversy, he affirms, "it is now in every body's mouth, and accounted the main text for the business." This half playful reference to the subject, which runs indeed through the whole tract, demonstrates, I think, that the orthodox doctrine had no hold on his mind.

6. That Newton did not believe in the pre-existence of Christ, is evident from his own commentary on this disputed passage, where his words are, in reference to Jesus, "being the Son of God, as well by his resurrection from the dead, Acts xiii. 33, as by his supernatural birth by the virgin, Luke i. 35." This is really coming down to Socinus and professor Stuart.

You will perhaps oblige your readers by printing in your work, Newton's sum of the whole matter, as contained in Sections 35 and 36.

SCRUTATOR.

We will readily comply with our correspondent's recommendation, after giving, as we have for some time intended to do, a brief abstract of Sir Isaac Newton's argument against the authenticity of the text, which now stands in our received version, as the seventh verse of 1 John v. This abstract will form our next article.

Sir Isaac Newton's History of the Text of the Three Heavenly Witnesses.

After a short introduction in the epistolary form, Newton gives in a few words the history of the text as follows.

"First, some of the Latins interpreted the spirit, water, and blood, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to prove them one. Then Jerome, for the same end, inserted the trinity in express words into his version. After him the Africans began to allege it against the Vandals, about sixty-four years after his death. Afterwards the Latins noted his variations in the margins of their books; and thence it began at length to creep into the text in transcribing, and that chiefly in the twelfth and following centuries, when disputing was revived by the schoolmen. And when printing came up, it crept out of the Latin into the printed Greek, against the authority of all the Greek MSS. and an-

cient versions; and from the Venetian presses it went soon after into Greece. Now the truth of this history will appear by considering the arguments on both sides."

He then begins with the arguments alleged for the genuineness of the verse, which he says are "the authorities of Cyprian, Athanasius, and Jerome, and of many Greek manuscripts, and almost all the Latin ones."

The passages cited from Cyprian, are the two following. "The Lord saith, 'I and the Father are one.' And again of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, it is written, 'And these Three are One.'"—"If one baptised among heretics be made the temple of God, tell me, I pray, of what God? If of the Holy Ghost, since these Three are One, how can the Holy Ghost be reconciled to him who is the enemy of either the Father or the Son?" With regard to these passages, Newton says, that he should have admitted them as good evidences for the genuineness of the text, could he have reconciled such an admission with the universal ignorance he met with of the disputed reading in the next age, among the Latins of Africa and Europe, as well as among the Greeks. Had it been in Cyprian's Bible, the Latins of the next age, when the whole Christian world were disputing about the trinity, and bringing forward all the arguments and texts, which could possibly be forced into the controversy, would certainly have been acquainted with a passage, which is the only one in the Scriptures, that even seems to assert the doctrine of trinity in unity. But the difficulty is easily cleared up, by considering, that the only words of the text quoted by Cyprian are, "And these Three are One;"

which words might have been taken from the eighth verse, where they relate to the spirit, the water, and the blood, and applied by the saint to his own purpose. That this is more than probable, appears from the testimony of Eucherius, bishop of Lion, in France, and contemporary to St. Austin, and that of St. Austin himself, who tells us that the spirit, water, and blood, were in their time understood to signify the trinity. The words of St. Austin are, "The spirit is the Father, for God is a Spirit; the water the Holy Ghost, for he is the water which Christ gives to them that thirst; and the blood the Son, for the word was made flesh." This high probability amounts to a certainty, when we find that Facundus, an African bishop of the sixth century, says expressly, that Cyprian interpreted the spirit, water, and blood, to be the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and thence made the evangelist affirm, that those three were one.* Testimony of this kind proves two important facts—the first, that Cyprian applied what was said of the spirit, water, and blood, to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—and the second, that neither he, nor any one else, would have thought of resorting to such an application, if the disputed text had been in existence, a direct evidence, ready to their hands. Another confirming circumstance is, that Cyprian does not say, "the Father, *the Word*, and the Holy Ghost," as it now stands in the received text, but "the Father, *the Son*, and the Holy Ghost."

Further light is thrown on the passages in Cyprian, by a similar passage in Tertullian, who was regarded by Cyprian as his master. In this passage, Tertullian only cites the words, "these three are one" to prove

* We have heard of *unitarian glosses*—what kind of a gloss is this?

his trinity, and then endeavours to strengthen the proof by quoting the much perverted text from John's Gospel, "I and the Father are one;" which he would not have done, if he had known of the seventh verse.

What is said of the testimony of Tertullian and Cyprian, may be also affirmed of that in the feigned disputation between Athanasius and Arius at Nice. The only words there cited are, "and these three are one." And these words are made applicable to the trinity by the same mystical interpretation of the spirit, water, and blood, which was resorted to by the Greeks as well as the Latins. This is manifest from the annotations on this text in some of their manuscripts. One manuscript is mentioned, which, over the words, "there are three that bear record [in earth] the spirit, the water, and the blood," has this remark, *that is, the Holy Ghost, and the Father, and He of Himself.* And against the words, "and these three are one," is written, *that is, one Deity, one God.*

From these marginal notes, the phrase in question gradually crept into the text. The first who is thought to have introduced it, is Jerome, in the preface to the canonical epistles, which goes under his name. In this preface, he complains that he had been accused by some of the Latins, of falsifying Scripture, by inserting the disputed text; and he answers, that former Latin translators had much erred from the faith, in putting only "the spirit, water, and blood," and omitting the testimony of "the three in Heaven," whereby the catholic faith is established. In this defence, he seems to say that he corrected the vulgar Latin translation by the original Greek; and this is

the great testimony, says Newton, the text relies upon. With regard to this testimony, it is to be considered, that in confessing the absence of the text from the Latin translations before his time, he cuts off all the authority of the present vulgar Latin. The accusation of his contemporaries proves also that he altered the public reading; for had the reading been dubious, no man could have charged him with downright falsification for taking either side. His recommending the text, also, for its usefulness to the catholic faith, is calculated to excite suspicion, and is far from being an authority for it.

In examining the question between Jerome and his accusers, Newton says, that they who have been conversant in his writings, observe a strange liberty which he takes in asserting things; many notable instances of which he has left us in those very fabulous lives of Paul and Hilarion, and on other occasions. But passing over this, he institutes an impartial examination of the subject in hand. The witnesses are the ancient translators of the Scriptures; the writers of his own age, and of the ages immediately before and after him; and the scribes who copied the Scriptures in all ages.

The ancient translators cited against Jerome, are chiefly the authors of the old Latin, of the Syriac, and the Æthiopic versions. In these most venerable and authentic translations, the text of the heavenly witnesses is left out; which proves its absence from the still older Greek MSS. from which they were translated. It is wanting also in other ancient versions; as in the Egyptian Arabic; the Armenian; and the Illyrican. In fact, it is contained in no version but the

modern vulgar Latin, and those other modern versions which have been influenced by it.

That it was neither in the original Greek, nor in the ancient versions, and that it was wholly unknown to the first churches, is most certain, by an argument alluded to before, that in all the vehement controversy which engaged the church both before and after Jerome's time, this text of the heavenly witnesses was not once thought of; the writings of those times were very many and copious; and there is no argument or text of Scripture, which they do not urge again and again. So far indeed were they from citing it, that whenever they quoted the place in John's epistle, where it has been so lately and unjustifiably inserted, they omit it altogether. The common way of quoting it was this; *there are three who bear witness, the spirit, the water, and the blood, and these three are one.* The words, *in earth*, are generally omitted. The names of Hesychius, Cassiodorus, Beda, Pope Leo the Great, and St. Ambrose, are mentioned; all of whom were as late or later than Jerome; for Jerome did not prevail with the churches of his own time to receive the testimony of "the three in Heaven." And for them to know his version, and not receive his testimony, was in effect to condemn it.

As for the Greeks, Cyril of Alexandria quotes that part of St. John's epistle twice, without the disputed text. Œcumenius, in his commentary on the place, omits the heavenly witnesses. So do Didymus Alexandrinus, and Gregory Nazianzen, and Nicetas.—And it is observable, that as the Eusebians* had contended that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,

* A sect of Arians.

were not to be *connumerated*, because they were things of a different kind, Nazianzen and Nicetas answer, that they may be connumerated, because St. John connumerates three things not consubstantial, namely, "the spirit, the water, and the blood." Now the objection of the Eusebians shows that the testimony of the heavenly witnesses was not in their copies, and the answer of the Catholics shows that it was not in theirs; for if it had been, they would, instead of merely citing a parallel case, have brought forward a text which was exactly the case in point.—The Eunomians,* too, objected against the Catholics, that the Holy Ghost is nowhere in Scripture conjoined with the Father and the Son, except in the form of baptism; and St. Basil, while he perplexes himself in searching out texts in answer, which are nothing to the purpose, never produces that of the three heavenly witnesses, which would have been just what he wanted—and therefore neither they nor he knew any thing about it.—Beside this, the famous epistle of pope Leo to Flavian, against Eutyches, which was generally applauded in the west, and solemnly approved and subscribed by all the bishops at the council of Chalcedon, quoted the text thus; *And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, becaust Christ is the truth; wherefore there are three who give testimony, the spirit, and the water, and the blood; and these three are one.*† It is evident therefore, that the

* Another sect of Arians, called after Eunomius, bishop of Cyzicus, who flourished in the fourth century.

† Et spiritus est qui testificatur, quoniam Christus est veritas; quia tres sunt qui testimonium dant, spiritus, et aqua, et sanguis, et hi tres unum sunt.

testimony of the three heavenly witnesses was absent from the received Scriptures in those ages.

Will you now say, continues Newton in a playful strain, that the testimony of "the three in heaven" was razed out of their books by the prevailing Arians? Yes, truly, those Arians were crafty knaves, that could conspire so cunningly and slyly all the world over at once (as at the word of a Mithridates) in the latter end of the reign of the emperor Constantius, to get all men's books in their hands, and correct them without being perceived; ay, and conjurers too, to do it without leaving any blot or chasm in their books, whereby the knavery might be suspected and discovered; and to wipe away the memory of it out of all men's brains, so that neither Athanasius, nor any body else, could afterwards remember that they had ever seen it in their books before; and out of their own books too.

This text was not in the Scriptures, therefore, in Jerome's time, which was the point to be proved. And if it was absent then, we are bound to believe that it was absent from the beginning; unless some better argument can be produced to establish its authenticity, than mere assertion, and an unsupported charge against the heretics.

After this discussion of St. Jerome's authority, the question is taken up concerning those manuscripts which contain the testimony of the three in heaven.—It is not to be found in the manuscripts of any language but the Latin; it was not in the Latin till Jerome's time, and his authority has been already valued. From his version it crept into the Latin manuscripts, and from them into the printed Greek, without any

other countenance; as they who first printed it had never seen it in an authentic Greek manuscript.

The Latin vulgate now in use, is a mixture of the old vulgar Latin and Jerome's version. Few of these manuscripts are more than four or five hundred years old. The latest generally contain the disputed text, and the oldest want it—which shows that it has crept in by degrees. Many ancient Latin manuscripts are enumerated by Newton, from all of which the text is absent.

But to go, he says, to the original of the corruption. Jerome's version was in use in the time of Gregory the Great, and there is no wonder if the testimony of the Three in heaven was quoted from it before. Eugenius, bishop of Carthage, in the seventh year of Hunneric, king of the Vandals, and in the year of Christ, 484, was the first who cited the text, in a summary of his faith exhibited to the king. A while after, Fulgentius, another African Bishop, disputing against the same Vandals, cited it again, and backed it by the passage in Cyprian, which has before been considered. This circumstance renders it highly probable, that the words of Cyprian, which were nothing more than an accommodation, were the authority for the text in the disputes with the ignorant Vandals; that is to say, there was no real authority for it whatever. It occurs also in Vigilius Tapsensis, another African bishop, contemporary with Fulgentius. Earlier writings have been alleged, but they have been abundantly proved to be forgeries.

But though Eugenius set it on foot among the Africans, yet it did not become of authority in Europe before the revival of learning in the twelfth and thir-

teenth centuries. In those ages St. Barnard, the schoolmen, Joachim, and the Lateran council, spread it abroad, and scribes began gradually to insert it into the text.

The Latins, after Jerome's version came into use, noted in the margin of their books, his corrections of the old vulgar Latin, and these the transcribers afterwards inserted in the text. They would not, of course, omit so important a one as the disputed passage. And to put the question at rest, there are footsteps of the insertion still remaining. The passage is altered in different ways, and though the testimony of "the three in heaven," is most generally placed before that of "the three in earth," in some copies it comes after it; the cause of which irregularity must have been, that the transcribers, finding the disputed text in the margin, and not knowing exactly where to put it, sometimes introduced it in the wrong place.

After the above discussion respecting the Latin writers and manuscripts, Newton proceeds to show how, and when, the text of the three heavenly witnesses was transferred from the Latin to the Greek. Here it deserves especially to be noted, that *the verse was generally omitted in the first editions of the Greek testament*, except in Spain. It was left out in the first and second editions of Erasmus, 1516 and 1519; in the edition of Francis Asulan, printed by Aldus in 1518; in that of Nicholas Gerbelius, 1521; that of Wolfius Cephalius, 1524; the Badian edition, 1526; and that of Simon Colinæus at Paris, 1534 —It was also about this time omitted in some editions of other western languages, as in the Saxon and German editions of

Luther; and in the Latin Tugurine editions of Peter Cholinus, 1543 and 1544.

The first edition in Greek which contained the text, was the famous Complutensian, printed under the patronage of cardinal Ximenes, at Complutum,* in Spain, in 1515, though not published till 1521. Afterwards, Erasmus, finding that he had given offence by omitting the verse, printed it in his third edition, in the year 1522, representing that "in his former editions he had printed the text as he found it in his manuscripts; but now there being found in England one manuscript which had the testimony of 'the three in heaven,' he had inserted it, according to that manuscript, for avoiding the calumnies raised against him." He retained it in his two following editions.

In 1550, Robert Stephens reprinted the edition of Erasmus, with alterations and various readings, which were taken from the Complutensian edition, and from fifteen Greek manuscripts, which he designated by the Greek numerals. He introduced the text of the Heavenly Witnesses, and noted against it in the margin, that it was wanting in *seven of his manuscripts*. From this manner of expressing himself, Beza drew the conclusion that he found it in all the rest, and asserted that such was the case, in his own edition of the Greek testament. The same assertion was made by others; and this is the main argument for the printed Greek text. Now it so happens, that the true state of the matter furnishes one of the strongest arguments against the text, and shows how utterly unauthorised was the conclusion of "dreaming Beza," as Newton calls him. It is well known, that a large proportion of the manu-

* Now Alcala de Henares, near Madrid.

scripts of the Greek testament, do not contain all the sacred books. Some have the Gospels alone; some the Gospels and Acts; some the Epistles alone, or the Epistles and Gospels, and so on. Among Stephens' fifteen manuscripts there were but *seven* which contained the Epistles; a fact, which is manifest from his citing these seven, and no others, in his various readings of that portion of the testament. In neither of these seven was the disputed text to be found; it was impossible that it should be in his other manuscripts, because they did not contain the Epistles; therefore it was not in a single one of his manuscripts, instead of being, as Beza took it on himself to say, in eight of them.

That the text was wanting in all Stephens' manuscripts, is further evident from the fact, that after diligent search, no manuscript containing it has yet been discovered in France.

So the authority of the printed text rests on that of the editions of Erasmus and cardinal Ximenes. But it has already been seen that Erasmus inserted it from a principle of fear, and because he had been told that there was *one* manuscript in England which contained it. Newton suspects that there never was such a manuscript, and that the story of its existence was a fabrication. Since his time, however, it has been well ascertained, that the same manuscript which Erasmus admitted as authority, is in the college library at Dublin, and that it is of no authority at all; for not only is it very modern, being probably written after the invention of printing, but the verse in question is evidently a translation from the Latin, by somebody who did not know much Greek; a fact betrayed by the

omission of the Greek article before the words signifying Father, Word, and Holy Ghost, and by other mistakes.*

With regard to the Complutensian edition, the opinion of Newton is, that the disputed text is there, also, nothing more than a translation from the Latin. This opinion he supports by the following reasons. First;

* This manuscript goes by the several names of *Codex Britannicus, Codex Montfortianus, and Codex Dublinensis.* We were much surprised to find, appended to an account of it in Rees's Cyclopædia, the following remarks by one of the American editors. "It can scarcely have escaped the observation of any attentive reader, that almost the whole of this article has been inserted for the sole purpose of showing, that the passage 1 John v. 7. so terrific to all Anti-trinitarians, ought to be considered as spurious. The authority, however, of Michaelis himself will not deter us from remarking, that the most of the reasoning here is forced and uncandid; more like that of an advocate desirous to say all in his power in support of his cause, than that of an impartial judge, intent only on discovering the truth, that he may pronounce a just sentence. Is it to be believed that such a scholar as Erasmus, who had left this passage out of his two first editions of the Greek testament, would have ever again inserted it, if he had found the passage in Greek to be such a clumsy and boyish translation from the Latin, and of course so totally destitute of authority, as it is here represented to be? We rather believe, notwithstanding all that is said by Michaelis, that the *Britannicus Codex Erasmi* could not be the same with that denominated Montfortianus and Dublinensis."

On these remarks, we will take the liberty of making a few remarks ourselves. In the first place, the circumstance that this manuscript is the only one which has been produced as authority for 1 John v. 7. is reason enough for its being noticed in the Cyclopædia. It would have been a strange omission if it had not been noticed In the next place, we would inform the writer of the remarks, that he never was more mistaken than in supposing that this text is *so terrific to all Anti-trinitarians.* Anti-trinitarians have little cause to be frightened at a passage, which, even if it were genuine, has been allowed by trinitarian commentators of the highest repute, *to afford no support to the doctrine* of the trinity—though the American editor

because the edition was chiefly printed after manuscripts borrowed from the pope's library; and when the Vatican manuscripts were afterward collated by command of the pope, the disputed text was wanting in them all. Secondly; because a marginal note, which

did not seem to be aware of the fact. The words of Calvin are, "Quod dicit, tres esse unum, ad essentiam non refertur, sed ad consensum potius." *The expression, three are one, must signify, in agreement, and not in essence.* In the same manner says Beza; and Macknight's paraphrase on the passage is, "these three are one, *in respect of the unity of their testimony.*" We are so often and heavily charged with *glossing*, that it is quite pleasant when we can get trinitarians to gloss for us—and this is not the only time they have performed the office. If there is any thing *terrific* in the matter to us, it is the unblushing perseverance with which a decidedly spurious passage has been kept in our Bibles, by those who ought to know better, and who do know better—we do not mean the writer of the remarks, for he appears to know little about it. This to be sure is a subject of terror; but it is the orthodox who ought to be startled by it, much more than ourselves.

The writer says, that the reasoning in the article is forced and uncandid. We say, and any fair minded man would say, that it is a temperate, impartial discussion of the authority of a certain manuscript, and nothing more. It does not even assert that the text is spurious: though Griesbach, a trinitarian, has rejected it as of no authority, and put against it his lowest mark of spuriousness.

Then as to what the editor says of Erasmus, and the "clumsy and boyish translation," he ought to have known, that Erasmus had made a most cowardly promise, that if *one* manuscript should be found which contained the text, he would print it in his next edition. He was told of this manuscript in England, and he did print it—though he suspected all the time that it was a translation from the Latin; *Quanquam et hunc suspicor, ad Latinorum codices fuisse castigatum;* those are his very words.

We conclude our remarks by observing, that the American editor, whoever he may be, had better not have meddled with such a subject, till he had, at least, made himself acquainted with the first elements of biblical criticism.

is a rare thing in this edition, is placed against the text, to justify its insertion; and the best justification which the editors give, is, not the reading of any Greek manuscript, but the authority of Thomas Aquinas; which, whatever authority it was for the Latin reading, was none for the Greek; for, as Newton says, "Thomas understood not Greek." Thirdly; when Stunica, one of the divines employed by cardinal Ximenes in the edition, was challenged by Erasmus to produce manuscript evidence for the disputed text, he was not able to cite one, but defended the passage by the authority of Jerome, and told Erasmus, in a magisterial tone, that the Greek manuscripts in this place were evidently corrupted. But in other places, says Newton, if he hath but one manuscript on his side, he produces it magnificently enough. Other Spanish divines endeavoured to find the reading but without success.

There is evidence that the Complutensian divines did sometimes correct the Greek by the Latin. That the passage in question is one of these, appears by their contenting themselves with the authority of Thomas Aquinas, instead of citing Greek manuscripts, and by the confession of Stunica that they had no manuscript which contained the passage.—Another proof of the spuriousness of the verse, is, that while the Greek manuscripts agree together in the reading of the genuine text, the only manuscript which contains the verse differs in its reading from the Complutensian edition.*

* Another manuscript, the *Codex Ravianus*, not mentioned by Newton, has been brought forward in this controversy, but it has been shown to be a mere copy of the Complutensian.

The above is the substance of Newton's argument—an argument which has not been, and cannot be, confuted; an argument which would have done honour to the greatest biblical critic of any age; and which proves that the poet Cowper truly called him

> Sagacious reader of the works of God,
> *And in his word sagacious.*

We will now, as we promised, quote the whole of the two concluding sections.

XXXV. Having given you the history of the controversy, I shall now confirm all that I have said from the sense of the text itself. For, without the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," the sense is good and easy, as you may see by the following paraphrase inserted in the text in a different character.

"WHO IS HE THAT OVERCOMETH THE WORLD, BUT HE THAT BELIEVETH THAT JESUS IS THE SON OF GOD, that Son spoken of in the Psalms, where he saith, 'Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.' 'THIS IS HE THAT, after the Jews had long expected him, CAME, first in a mortal body, BY baptism of WATER, AND then in an immortal one by shedding his BLOOD upon the cross, and rising again from the dead; NOT BY WATER ONLY, BUT BY WATER AND BLOOD; being the Son of God, as well by his resurrection from the dead, Acts xiii. 33. as by his supernatural birth of the Virgin, Luke i. 35. AND IT IS THE SPIRIT also THAT, together with the water and blood, BEARETH WITNESS of the truth of his coming; BECAUSE THE SPIRIT IS TRUTH; and so a fit and unexceptionable witness. FOR THERE ARE THREE THAT BEAR RECORD of his coming; THE SPIRIT, which he promised to send, and which was shed forth upon us in the form of cloven tongues, and in

various gifts; THE baptism of WATER, wherein God testified, 'This is my beloved Son; AND THE shedding of his BLOOD, accompanied with his resurrection, whereby he became the most faithful martyr or witness of this truth. AND THESE THREE, the spirit, the baptism, and passion of Christ, AGREE IN witnessing ONE and the same thing, namely, that the Son of God is come, and, therefore, their evidence is strong; for the law requires but two consenting witnesses, and here we have three. AND IF WE RECEIVE THE WITNESS OF MEN, THE threefold WITNESS OF GOD, which he bare of his Son, by declaring at his baptism, 'This is my beloved Son;' by raising him from the dead, and by pouring out his spirit on us, IS GREATER; and therefore ought to be more readily received"

XXXVI. Thus is the sense plain and natural, and the argument full and strong; but, if you insert the testimony of "the Three in heaven," you interrupt and spoil it. For the whole design of the apostle being here to prove to men by witness the truth of Christ's coming, I would ask how the testimony of "the Three in heaven" makes to this purpose. If their testimony be not given to men, how does it prove to them the truth of Christ's coming? If it be, how is the testimony in heaven distinguished from that on earth? It is the same spirit which witnesses in heaven and in earth. If in both cases it witnesses to us men, wherein lies the difference between its witnessing in heaven, and its witnessing in earth? If, in the first case, it does not witness to men, to whom doth it witness? And to what purpose? And how does its witnessing make to the design of St. John's discourse? Let them make good sense of it, who are able. For my part, I

can make none. If it be said that we are not to determine what is scripture, and what not, by our private judgments; I confess it in places not controverted; but in disputable places, I love to take up with what I can best understand. It is the temper of the hot and superstitious part of mankind, in matters of religion, ever to be fond of mysteries; and for that reason, to like best what they understand least. Such men may use the apostle John as they please; but I have that honour for him, as to believe that he wrote good sense; and therefore take that sense to be *his*, which is the best; especially since I am defended in it by so great authority. For I have on my side the authority of the Fourth General Council, and, so far as I know, of all the churches in all ages, except the modern Latin, and such others as have lately been influenced by them; and that also of all the old versions, and Greek manuscripts, and ancient Latin ones; and nothing against me, but the authority of Jerome, and the credulity and heat of his followers.

For to tell us of other manuscripts, without ever letting us know in what libraries they were to be seen; to pretend manuscripts, which, since their first discovery, could never be heard of; nor were then seen by persons whose name and credit we know; is plainly to impose on the learned world, and ought not to pass any longer for plain dealing. The Spaniards tell us plainly that they followed the Latin, and by the authority of Thomas left out the clause, "And these Three are One," in the eighth verse, as inserted by the Arians. And yet St. Ambrose, St. Austin, Eucherius, and other Latins, in the Arian age, gathered the unity of the Deity from this clause; and the omission

of it is now, by printing it, acknowledged to be an erroneous correction. The manuscript in England wanted the same clause, and therefore, if there was any such MS, it was a corrected one, like the Spanish edition, and the manuscript of Valesius. Erasmus, who printed the triple testimony in heaven by that English manuscript, never saw it; tells us it was a new one; suspected its sincerity; and accused it publicly in his writings on several occasions, for several years together; and yet his adversaries in England never answered his accusation; never endeavoured to satisfy him and the world about it; did not so much as let us know, where the record might be consulted for confuting him; but, on the contrary, when they had got the Trinity into his edition, threw by their manuscript, if they had one, as an almanac out of date. And can such shuffling dealings satisfy considering men? Let manuscripts at length be produced, and freely exposed to the sight of the learned world; but let such manuscripts be produced as are of authority; or else let it be confessed, that whilst Jerome pretended to correct the Latin by the Greek, the Latins have corrected both the Latin and the Greek by the sole authority of Jerome.

Spirit of Orthodoxy in the West.

THERE has been handed us a pamphlet, published in Lexington, Kentucky, which proves, we are sorry to say, that the impolitic, as well as bigoted and rancorous opposition to President Holley, in that place, on account of his religious opinions, has lost nothing of the fierceness, with which it assailed him when he first

took charge of Transylvania University. The publication before us is an answer of Mr. William G. Hunt, to an attack made on himself, in a newspaper, by the Rev. Nathan H. Hall. Four distinct charges are replied to with considerable force and spirit; but that with which we were most interested, is the one which refers to Mr. Holley. The charge is thus stated by the writer of the pamphlet.

"I am called 'the echo of the President and his party;' it is asserted that I am 'known to go all lengths with them;' and I am said to be 'under the wing of the President of Transylvania University,' who is evidently referred to under the title of my *master*.'"

To this abuse Mr. Hunt replies in an indignant and independent manner. Take for instance the following paragraph.

"What right has Mr. Hall, directly or indirectly, to pronounce me an infidel in disguise, or, which is the same thing, to say that I go all lengths with those whom he chooses to pronounce infidels in disguise? Every man, according to this system, who does not join these crusaders in their anathemas against the president, and aid them in their efforts to destroy the university, is liable to be denounced as irreligious, immoral, socinian, and infidel. It is time for the community, for the really pious and sincere among the professors of religion of all denominations, to set their faces against this unchristian and vindictive spirit of persecution. I care not for the denunciations of Mr. Hall, Mr. M'Farland, or the whole host of reverend slanderers. As it respects my religious opinions, I do not acknowledge any of them for my father confessors, and however heretical they may choose to suspect or pronounce me to be, I trust I shall never be found guilty of wantonly defaming my neighbour, or of exhibiting the spirit of a demon under the guise of a meek and humble follower of the Lamb."

He then notices, and directly contradicts, the coarse slanders which have been connected with Mr. Holley's name. "Never have I witnessed," he says, "a more rancorous and vindictive spirit of persecution than has been exhibited towards Mr. Holley. Were he a mon-

ster in human form, he could not have been more virulently and violently assailed." He professes his admiration of Mr. Holley's talents; his conviction that the university owes to his exertions its present prosperous state; and his own satisfaction in having given him his warm support; and he warns the enemies of that gentleman, that if they succeed in effecting his dismission, they will inflict a mortal wound on the success of the seminary over which he presides.

We believe that this opposition will have no lasting bad effect on the reputation and usefulness of President Holley. But it saddens us to witness such narrow, ignorant, fanatical attacks on those who are labouring for the best interests of the country.

Geneva Catechism—Third Part.

The third part of the Geneva Catechism, consisting of questions and answers on the *Duties of the Christian Religion*, has been lately published at Boston. It completes the work. The three parts, bound together, will make a neat duodecimo volume, and furnish to those who would train up their children in the way they should go, an almost unexceptionable initiation into the system of Christian doctrine and duty.

INDEX.

A.

Æthiopic version, 296
Ambrose, St. quotes 1 John v. 297
America, United States of, its religious prospects good, 100
American Education Society, eighth report of the, 236
Andover, orthodox system there, 90. Its Institution, 101. Its creed, 102. Particularly orthodox there once in five years, 195. Its system of the atonement, 197
Anxiety, worldly, unreasonableness of its excess, 14
Apollinaris, or Apollinarius, the younger, 124
Aquinas, Thomas, 306
Arabic version, 296
Arians banished from Poland, 74. Eusebians and Eunomians, sects of, 207, 298. Charged with corrupting scripture, 299
Arius, 123, 124, 295
Armenian version, 296
Articles, thirty-nine of unitarianism, 205
Assembly, General, its power, 98. Not to be apprehended, 101, 102
Assembly's Catechism, quinquennial respect for it at Andover, 194
Asulan, Francis, his edition of the testament, 301
Athanasius, cited as authority for 1 John v. 7. 293, 295
Atonement, none made on the trinitarian system, 171. Dr. Murdock's discourse on the, 193. Theatrical nature of his system, 196
Attacks on the characters of unitarians, 151
Augustine, St. 22, 294
Authority of the Lord's Supper, 1. Objections to it answered. 10

B.

Bacon, Lord, quotation from, 200
Badian edition of the testament, 301
Baltimore Unitarian Book Society, third annual report of the, 199
Baptism, article on, 217
Barclay's Apology referred to, *note*, 11
Barnard, St. 301
Barrow, Dr. on the two natures of Christ, *note*, 128
Basil, St 298
Beda, quotes 1 John v. 297
Belsham, Rev. Mr. his sentiments misrepresented, 66
Beza, mistakes Stephens, 302. On 1 John v. 7. *note*, 305
Bible, translations of the, in Holland, 86, 93. We must not leave it, 281
Biddeford, ordination at, 240
Bigelow, Rev. Andrew, his ordination, 35
Blasphemy, modern use of the word, 139
Bonner, bishop, his instruction to his clergy, 120
Bowring's Russian Anthology, lines from, 230
Britannicus Codex, 303
Brooklyn, installation there, 155. Notice of the exercises, 272

Buckland, professor, noticed in the Quarterly Review, 250

C.

Cabot, Hon. George, obituary of, 75
Calvin, followed St. Augustine, 22. His opinions adopted in Holland, 87. On 1 John v. 7. *note*, 305
Cambridge, theological institution there, 117
Campbell Rev. John, unitarian minister at Pittsburgh, 84, 120
Carlisle, the bookseller, his trial, 190
Cassiodorus, 297
Catechism, Geneva, 3rd part, 312
Catholics, their proselytism, 23. Dispute with the unitarians of Racow, *note*, 73. Persecuted in Holland, 91
Cave's Historia Literaria referred to, *note*, 124, 126
Cerinthians, heretics, 122
Chandois, Lord, Queen Mary's letter to him, 108
Channing, Rev. Dr. noticed in the Quarterly Review, 249
Chillingworth, on transubstantiation, *note*, 148
Cholinus, Peter, his edition of the Testament, 302
Christ, see Jesus Christ.
Christ crucified, meaning of the phrase, 274
Christian, the, a religious paper, 239
Christian Advocate, its bigotry, 62
Christian Magazine, unitarians accused in it, 136
Christian Repository, quoted from, 235
Christianity, has nothing to apprehend from investigation, 21. Fundamental doctrines of, 24. Plainness of its doctrines, 32. Soon disfigured by error, 121. Virtue its great end, 241. Does not consist in forms, 268. Nature of its morality, 273
Christians, are they commanded to celebrate the Lord's Supper, 6. Should keep the Lord's Day, 224. Of their goods, 221. Of their oath, 222. Who they are, 267
Christie, Rev. William, obituary of, 150
Church, in Holland, history of the, 85. No church is a judge of faith, 106. Articles on the, 214. Traditions of the, 220. And state, 231
Cicero, quoted, 48
Coleridge, extract from his essay on Epitaphs, 257
Colinæus, Simon, his edition of the Testament, 301
Colman, Rev. Henry, his dedication sermon at Lynn, 113
Communicants, qualifications of, 281
Communion, see Lord's Supper.
Complutensian edition of the Bible, 302
Congregationalists, creeds and platforms of, 52
Consecration of bishops and ministers, 221
Consociations, their glory on the wane, 156
Constantius, emperor, 299
Consubstantiality, use of the term, *note*, 123
Consubstantiation, doctrine of 150
Conversion, doctrine of explained, 264
1 Corinthians, x, xi. 8, 9, 145. Explained, 284. Locke's paraphrase of, *note*, 288
Council of Ephesus, 125. Of Constantinople, 127. Second of Ephesus, *ib.* Of Chalcedon, *ib.* 128, 298. Third of Constantinople, *note*, *ib.* The Lateran, 301
Councils, of their authority, 215
Cowper, lines on Sir Isaac Newton, 307

Cracow, assemblies of early unitarians held there, 72
Crashaw, Richard, lines by, 180
Creed, the Nicene, 123
Creeds, the source of intolerance, 45. Article on the, 210
Crellius, translation from an article prefixed to his works, 70
Cyprian, St. cited as authority for 1 John v. 7, 293
Cyril, St. quoted, 271. Quotes 1 John v. 297

D.

Death of a son, lines on the, 230
Death-bed repentance, 271
Dedication sermon at Lynn, Colman's, 113
Deity of the Son acknowledged at the council of Nice, 123
Dewey, Rev. Orville, his ordination, 204
Didymus Alexandrinus, 297
Docetæ, heretics, 122
Doctrines of Christianity, plainness of them, 32
Dort, synod of, 88. Canons of, 92
Drusius, 86
Dublinensis Codex, 303

E.

Eastern tale, 103
Education Society, their bigotry, 236
Egyptian Arabic version, 296
Election, article on, 213
English church, discordance of opinions in the, 51
Episcopius, 86
Epistles, the, not avoided by unitarians, but explained by many of them, 67
Epitaphs, extract from Coleridge's essay on, 257
Erasmus, on 1 John v. 7. 302. *note*, 304
Eucharist, see Lord's Supper,
Eucherius, bishop of Lion, 294
Eugenius, bishop of Carthage, 300
Eunomians, a sect of Arians, 298
Eusebians, a sect of Arians, 297
Eusebius, *note*, 123
Eutyches, some account of him and his heresy, 126. Leo's epistle against, 298
Evagrius, his Ecclesiastical History referred to, *note*, 126, 127
Example of Christ, 12
Excommunicated persons, how to be avoided, 220

F.

Facundus, 294
Fawcett's Sermons, extract from, 176
Flavian, Leo's epistle to, 298
Form of God, Christ in the, phrase explained, 37
Freeman, Rev. Dr. his charge at the installation of Mr. May, 274
Free-will, article on, 211
Fulgentius, 300
Fuller, Dr. Andrew, his book on Socinianism, and attack on Dr. Priestley, 131

G.

Geneva Catechism, third part, 312
Geology, its bearing on the Mosaic account of the creation, 250
Gerbelius, Nicholas, his edition of the testament, 301
Gibbon, on the grave of Nestorius, *note*, 126
God, his Providence not to be distrusted, 16. His fear actuates all honest believers, 28. Does not require us to believe what we cannot understand, 33. Cannot be robbed of his perfections, 39. Form of, the phrase defined, *note*, 41. Influence of a knowledge of him, 83. His nature comprehended but by himself, 95. Of faith in his unity, 207. His word, *ib.*

His incomprehensibility, 255. Desires the happiness of his creatures, 259
Good works, article on the, 211
Gospel, its sanctions, 260
Gregory the Great, 300
Gregory Nazianzen, 297
Grotius, 86. Opposes Prince Maurice of Orange, 88

H.

Hammer's History of Persian Letters, story from, 179
Hammond, on the phrase, *form of God*, note, 41
Hare, bishop, his letter on the study of the Scriptures, 30
Harvard University slandered, 236
Heavenly Witnesses, text of the three, 292
Hebrews ii. 15, 286
Heresy, Milton on, 105. Queen Mary on, 108
Heringa, 94
Hesychius, cited, *note*, 41, 297
Hogerberts, 88
Holland, protestant church in, 86
Holley, Rev. Horace, his sermon on the death of Col. Morrison, 115. Abused by the orthodox, 310
Holy Ghost, article on the, 209
Homilies, article on the, 221
Honorius, pope, anathematized by the third council of Constantinople, *note*, 128
Hooper, bishop, his execution, 108
Hunneric, king, 300
Hunt, W G. his reply to Rev. Mr. Hall, 310

I.

Illyrican version, 296
Immortality, its connexion with mortality, 257
Incarnation, doctrine of the, 125, *note*, 128
Incomprehensibility of God, 255
Index Expurgatorius, 188
Installation at Medford, 35. At Brooklyn, 155. Exercises there, 272
Intolerance, creeds the source of it, 45. In Holland, 91

K.

Kay, Rev. Mr. his sermon at the opening of the unitarian church in Pittsburg, 129
Kentish, Rev. Mr. notices a work of Dr. Fuller, 132
Klopstock, translation of one of his psalms, 30
Knowledge, the friend of religion, 181. May always be conducive to happiness, 184

L.

Latin version, 296, 300
Learning, not opposed to religion, 181
Le Clerc, on the phrase, *form of God*, note, 41. On the phrase, *thought it not robbery*, note, 42. On the arrogance of the Jewish doctors, 59. On consubstantiality, *note*, 124. Referred to, *note*, 127
Leo the Great, 297. His epistle against Eutyches, 298
Lessons, from Scripture, 85
Liberty of opinion, extract from preface to Watson's Tracts, 21 Of the press, 186
Licensing system, bad, 189
Lightfoot, Dr. his account of the celebration of the passover, 144
Lithuania, unitarians in, 72
Locke's paraphrase of part of 1 Cor. xi. 288
Lord's Day, its observance recommended, 223
Lord's Supper, its authority, 1. The accounts of its institution by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul, 3, 4. It was to be celebrated by the disciples after their master's death, 5. And by Christians in all ages, 6. Objections to its authority considered, 10. Its nature and design, 140. Like the

Passover, it is a memorial, 142. Article on the, 218. Its efficacy and obligation, 277
Luther, his doctrine of consubstantiation, 150

M.

Macknight, on 1 John v. 7. *note*, 305
Magistrates, their power, 221
Mark iii. 29, 286
Marriage of priests, 219
Mary, Queen, her order for the execution of bishop Hooper, 108
Mason, Rev. Dr. his farewell discourse, 138
Maurice, Prince of Orange, 88
May, Rev. S. J. installed at Brooklyn, 155. Services at his installation, 272
Mediatorial office of Christ, 233
Mental improvement, religion its friend, 181
Michaelis on the Codex Montfortianus, *note*, 304
Miller, Rev. Dr. his Letters on Unitarianism, and abuse of unitarians, 133. He and his nervous friends, 249
Milton, on heresy, 105. Quotation from his Areopagitica, 189. Another from the same, 192
Ministry, qualifications for the, 215
Monophysite heresy, *note*, 126
Monothelite heresy, *note*, 128
Montfortianus Codex, 303
Morality, christian, 273
Morrison, Col. James, his legacy to Transylvania University, 115. Sketch of his life and character by president Holley, 116
Mortality and immortality, 257
Mosaic account of the creation, 250
Mosheim, partial in his account of the Polish unitarians, 69
Murdock, Professor, his discourse on the atonement noticed, 193

N.

Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, his opinions with regard to the person of Christ, 125. His exile and death, *note*, 126
Netherlands revolt from Spain, and state of religion there, 87
New Bedford, ordination at, 204
Newton, Sir Isaac, Jesuit's edition, of his works, 251. His unitarianism, 289. His history of 1 John v. 7, 292
New year's wish, from Fawcett's sermons, 176
Nicene council, 123. Creed, *ib.* Fathers of the, *note*, 123
Nicetas, 297, 298

O.

Oaths, how far lawful, 222
Obituary, of the Hon George Cabot, 75. Of Mrs. Amy Toulmin, 119. Of Rev. William Christie, 150. Of Judge Toulmin, 237
Œcumenicus, 297
Oldenbarneveld, 88
Ordination, at New Bedford, 204. At Biddeford, 240
Original sin, article on, 210
Orthodoxy, spirit of, 60, 235, 236, 310. Not remarkably consistent, 65

P.

Paine, Thomas, works published by Carlisle, 190
Passover, feast of the, its resemblance to the Lord's Supper, 142. Its difference from it, 143. Manner of its celebration, 143
Peabody, Rev. Mr. his performance at Mr. May's installation. 275
Pearce, bishop, his account of the Jewish customs at festivals. 143
Peirce, on the phrase, *thought*

it not robbery to be equal with God, note, 42
Persecution, its unreasonableness, 50
Petavius, his Dogmata Theologica referred to, *notes*, 123, 124, 127, 128
Pharisee and Publican, 180
Philippians ii. 6, 9. Explained, 37
Pierpont, Rev. Mr. his sermon on the mediatorial office of Christ, 233
Pittsburgh, unitarian society there, 84. Church opened there. 120
Plainness of the christian doctrines, 32
Platonizing Fathers, their use of the term consubstantiality, *note*, 123
Poetry, 112, 180, 230, 255
Poland, early unitarians in, 69
Prayer, objects of, 109
Preaching, cold, 120
Predestination, article on, 213
Presbyterian Magazine, referred to, 61, 64, 134
Presbyterians, differences of opinion among them, 52
Press, liberty of the, 186
Prettyman, his elements referred to, *note*, 129
Priestley, Dr. attacked by Andrew Fuller, 131. His theological works reviewed by Rev. Mr. Christie, 151
Princeton, its orthodoxy opposed to that of Andover, 90 Its seminary, 101
Protestants, cannot be justified in exclusiveness, 23
Psalm, by Klopstock, 30
Purgatory, article on, 215

Q.

Quakers, their objections to the authority of the Lord's Supper, 11
Quarterly Review, its liberality in some instances, 249

R.

Racovian Catechism, Rees's translation of the, 69
Racow, yearly synod of unitarians there, 72. Disturbance by the students of the unitarian college, 73
Rammohun Roy, new work proposed by him, 153. Sketch of his History, 201. Rees's Cyclopædia, interpolation in, *note*, 304
Reformation in Holland, 86
Regeneration, explained, 263
Religion the friend of mental improvement, 181. Its design, demands, and offices, 242
Remonstrants, the, persecuted, 91
Repentance and conversion, essay on the doctrines of, 258. Not to be deferred, 269. Taylor on death-bed repentance, 271
Resurrection of Christ, 209
Roberts, William, native unitarian preacher at Madras, 34
Romeyn, Rev. Dr. his account of unitarians, 136
Rosenmuller, referred to, 54

S.

Sabbath, Christian, observance of the, 223, 253
Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, see Lord's Supper.
Sacrament, article on the, 216
Sadi, story from, 179
Salvation, of obtaining it, 214
Schleusner, cited, *note*, 41, 42, 54
Schlichtingius, on the phrase, *equal to God*, note, 43. Banished, and his book burnt, 73
Scripture Lessons, noticed, 35
Scriptures, have received unitarian expositions from trinitarians, 63. Given to communicate knowledge, 182. Sufficient for salvation, 209
Segismund the second, of Poland, tolerated unitarianism, 70

Segismund, Prince John, tolerates unitarians in Transylvania, and was himself a unitarian, 71
Simonides, story of him, 257
Sin after baptism, 212
Socinus, Lælius, and Faustus, revived unitarianism, 70
Sparks, Rev. Jared, notice of the third number of his Collection, 28. His Inquiry noticed, 36. Extracts from his Inquiry, 45, 46. His donation to the Baltimore Unitarian Book Society, 203. Fourth number of his Collection, 289
Spring, Dr, his church, 101, 102
Stephens, Robert, his edition of the Testament, 302. His manuscripts, 303
Stoinski, quoted, 68
Stuart, professor, his doctrine of two natures, 129. Quoted, 168
Stunica, his controversy with Erasmus, 306
Supererogation, works of 212
Synod of Dort, 88. Its constitution, 90

T.

Taylor, Jeremy, on death-bed repentance, 271
Tertullian, quoted, 23. His testimony for 1 John v. 7. 294
Testament, Old, article on the, 210
Thayer, Rev. Dr. his address at Mr. May's installation, 276
Theodoret, his Ecclesiastical History referred to, *notes*, 123, 124
Theodosius, emperor, *note*, 126
Theological institution at Cambridge, 117
Thirty-nine articles of unitarianism, 205
Three heavenly witnesses, text of the, 289, 292
Toleration, remarks on, by Bishop Watson, 21
Toulmin, Hon. Harry, obituary of, 237
Transubstantiation, absurdity of the doctrine, 146. Account of it, 147. Remarks on it. 148. Chillingworth's remarks on it, *note*, *ib*. Founded on misapprehension of language, 150
Toulmin, Dr. Joshua, 119
Toulmin, Mrs. Amy, obituary of, 119
Tracy, Rev. Thomas, ordination of. 240
Traditions of the church, 220
Transylvania, unitarians there, 71
Transylvania university, (Kentucky) bequest to it, 115
Treasures of the deep, poetry, 112
Trinitarianism, state of the doctrine in Holland, 94
Trinitarians destroy the personal unity of Christ, 163. Expose him to the charge of equivocation, 164
Truth, not to be shackled, 189. Must prevail, 193. Cannot oppose truth, 252
Two natures of Christ, historical sketch of the doctrine, 121. Arguments against it, 157

U.

Unitarian Book Society at Baltimore, 199
Unitarian churches in Poland, Lithuania, &c 72
Unitarian Fund Society in England, 84
Unitarianism, in Holland, 96. General progress of, 200. The thirty-nine articles of, 205. Of Sir Isaac Newton, 289
Unitarian society at Pittsburgh, 84. Church opened there, 120
Unitarians, to be pardoned if in error, 28. False charges against them, 62. Do not conceal their sentiments, 65. Among the best com-

mentators on the Epistles, 67 In Poland, 69. Persecuted there, 73. Their characters attacked by Dr. Fuller, Dr. Miller, &c. 131. Have been reluctant to notice such charges, 132. Their belief, 137. Desire no converts but from conviction, 203. Their fortieth article, 222
Unity of God, article on the, 207

V.

VERSEMSKY, a Russian poet, lines by, 230
Valerius, 310
Vander Palm, professor, his translation of the Bible, 94
Vigilius Tapsensis, 300
Virtue, the great end of christianity, 141. Defined, 247. Real, 269
Vossius, vindicated the inspiration of the Septuagint, 252

W.

WALKER, Rev. James, his sermon at Mr. May's installation, 272
Washing of feet, not a rite of Christianity, 11
Watson, bishop, on toleration and liberty of opinion, 21
Washington, his opinions on the proper offices of religion and its ministers, 231
Whitby's Last Thoughts, in Sparks' Collection, 28 An extract from it on the plainness of the christian doctrines, 32. On the phrase, *equal to God, note*, 43
Wolfius Cephalius, his edition of the testament, 301
Word of God, meaning of the phrase, 207
Works, articles on, 211
Wright, Richard, his preaching, 34

X.

XIMENES, Cardinal, his Polyglott, 302, 304

Y.

YALE College, extraordinary piety there, 236

END OF VOL. V.

[redacted]